

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 962

SO 016 509

AUTHOR Matusiak, Frederick C., Ed.
TITLE World History Workshop (Colorado Springs, Colorado, July 13-15, 1983).
INSTITUTION Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo.
REPORT NO USAFA-TR-84-8
PUB DATE Oct 84
NOTE 80p.; For related documents, see SO 016 507-508. Photographs may not reproduce clearly.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Content; *Curriculum Development; Educational Objectives; Educational Practices; Higher Education; *History Instruction; Institutional Cooperation; *Instructional Improvement; Modernization; Relevance (Education); Secondary Education; Student Participation; Teaching Methods; *World History

ABSTRACT

Described is a workshop that brought together world history teachers from the Colorado Springs (Colorado) area and new instructors at the U.S. Air Force Academy to discuss problems in world history instruction. There were six workshop sessions, each including presentations and discussions. This report summarizes both the presentations and the discussions. The session titles and the names of the presenters are: Session 1, "Where Are We: World History Today" (Joe C. Dixon and Kevin Reilly); Session 2, "Looking for Meaning: Varieties of History" (Arnold Schrier); Session 3, "Putting It Together: Course Approaches" (Kevin Reilly); Session 4, "Modernization as a Paradigm: Dead or Alive" (Joe C. Dixon, John Albert, and Robert Roeder); Session 5, "Tools of the Trade: Available Resources" (Marilynn Hitchens and Robert Roeder); and Session 6, "The Ultimate Challenge: Teaching World History" (John M. Thompson). The appendices, which comprise approximately half of the report, contain world history syllabi from the Air Force Academy and the University of Denver, a list of recommended world history textbooks for the secondary grades, and a list of the workshop participants. (RM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED259962

1983 WORLD HISTORY WORKSHOP



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

CAPTAIN FREDERICK C. MATUSIAK
EDITOR

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY
COLORADO 80840

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bryant P. Shaw

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."


BEST COPY AVAILABLE

54016509

This research report is presented as a competent treatment of the subject, worthy of publication. The United States Air Force Academy vouches for the quality of the research, without necessarily endorsing the opinions and conclusions of the authors.

This report has been cleared for open publication and/or public release by the appropriate Office of Information in accordance with AFR 12-30. There is no objection to unlimited distribution of this report to the public at large, or by DTIC to the National Technical Information Service.

This research report is approved for publication.



THOMAS E. McCANN
Director of Research and
Computer-Based Education

1983 WORLD HISTORY WORKSHOP

Edited By

Frederick C. Matusiak



PREFACE

The Department of History at the U.S. Air Force Academy has for some time been committed to the teaching of world history. Recognition of the Air Force's role in America's global responsibilities gave early emphasis to area studies in the Academy's curriculum, and since 1968 a world history course has been a part of every cadet's education.

Members of the department are at once officers and historians. As members of the historical profession, the department has sought to actively participate in the re-thinking of the nature, role, and direction of introductory undergraduate courses. Particularly, it has hosted discussions and meetings on the topic. In 1979, after a curriculum review and as a result of several annual world history workshops which brought together members of the department with individual historians, the department published World History in Liberal Military Education, describing the Academy's program in world history. In May of 1982, when a World History Teaching Conference was held at the Academy, it attracted four times the number of participants expected. A report, 1982 World History Teaching Conference, was published in 1983. During the 1982-83 academic year, the department decided that a world history workshop, bringing together world history teachers from the local area as well as new Academy instructors, would be worthwhile. The three-day workshop opened on July 13, 1983. This report summarizes its deliberations.

The format of a teaching workshop suggested that this report take a different form. Speakers at the workshop adopted an informal style, encouraging discussion as they made their points. In fact, the discussions produced many of the workshop's highlights. The number of participants was small enough to allow for a refreshing exchange of ideas. This report, then, summarizes both the presentations and the discussions. (The one exception to this format was Professor Schrier's presentation which appears as a verbatim article.)

There were six workshop sessions; in this report the summaries appear in order of their presentation. The first session had as its theme "Where Are We: World History Today"; it included presentations by Major Joe C. Dixon of the Academy and Professor Kevin Reilly of Somerset County College, New Jersey. Major Dixon opened the workshop and offered some ideas for discussion. He suggested that the participants might consider exactly what world history is, why it is worth studying, and who should teach it. He also proposed a question of interest to all world history teachers: how to organize a course. Professor Kevin Reilly discussed the recent formation and the activities of the World History Association. The discussion following their remarks was lively and stimulating and set the tone for the entire workshop. Of particular interest was the exchange of ideas between secondary school and college instructors. While each group has its own particular problems and goals, the discussion resulted in agreement that coordination between the two groups was beneficial--perhaps essential--if world

history is to remain an integral part of American education.

The second session, "Looking for Meaning: Varieties of History," was led by Professor Arnold Schrier, the Academy's Distinguished Visiting Professor in History. In a paper, Professor Schrier examined five major world historiographic traditions. While historians in the West consistently look for meaning in history, he argued, this is not the case for all societies. This characteristic of looking for patterns or processes in history has often led to an ethnocentrism in the West. For Professor Schrier, therefore, world history should concentrate more on the common problems which have confronted mankind everywhere and the different responses to those problems.

Professor Kevin Reilly led the third session, "Putting it Together: Course Approaches," which addressed various approaches to organizing the world history course. The session examined other topics as well, such as the value of film and other audio-visual materials in the classroom, the topical and narrative approach to history, and the problem of appealing to a student audience of varied ability.

The fourth session concentrated on one particular approach to teaching world history--the modernization paradigm. Major Joe Dixon and Captain John Albert of the Academy faculty discussed the Academy's experimentation with the modernization theme. Professor Robert Roeder of the University of Denver presented some unique touches that he has added to the modernization model.

The topic for the fifth session was "Tools of the Trade: Available Resources." Dr. Marilyn Hitchens, a secondary school teacher from the Denver area, opened the session. Dr. Hitchens summarized the strengths and weaknesses of available material for secondary school instructors. In her view, there are problems in preparing and organizing a world history course because the field of world history is relatively new. The dividends derived from the world history course, however, are worth the effort. She agreed with others at the workshop that it is more important for the advocates of world history to come up with some type of unified and organized program than to debate personal idiosyncrasies in approach. Professor Roeder's presentation elaborated on his previous remarks at the workshop dealing with his world history course. A key point in Professor Roeder's remarks is that a world history course must tell a story and not simply be a world travelogue.

The final session, chaired by Professor John M. Thompson of the American Universities Field Staff, served to wrap up the entire workshop. In a guided exercise, the workshop participants were given the opportunity to express what they felt were the most important topics in a world history course. Following the exercise, Professor Thompson discussed what he referred to as the transfer problem--getting the student's interest in the topic and having him retain information. Professor Thompson stressed that active learning and student involvement in the subject were far

superior to a series of sterile lectures. Finally, he noted that the participants ought to have a sense of pride that they had embarked on a new frontier of history.

It is interesting to note that many of the comments made at the workshop have recently been echoed nationally. The National Commission on Excellence in Education, in its widely discussed report to the American people, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, noted its position in this key passage:

History is not kind to idlers. The time is long past when America's destiny was assured simply by an abundance of natural resources and inexhaustible enthusiasm, and by our relative isolation from the malignant problems of older civilizations. The world is indeed one global village. We live among determined, well-educated, and strongly motivated competitors. We compete with them for international standing and markets, not only with products but also with the ideas of our laboratories and neighborhood workshops. America's position in the world may once have been reasonably secure with only a few exceptionally well-trained men and women. It is no longer.

The Department of History expresses thanks to Marilyn Hitchens, Kevin Reilly, Robert Roeder, Arnold Schrier, and John M. Thompson for their editorial comments and for the permission to publish their presentations.

Frederick C. Matusiak

Frederick C. Matusiak, Captain, USAF
Assistant Professor
Department of History

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface by Frederick C. Matusiak	iii
Session 1: "Where are We: World History Today" Presentations: Joe C. Dixon and Kevin Reilly	1
Session 2: "Looking for Meaning: Varieties of History" Presentation: Arnold Schrier	5
Session 3: "Putting it Together: Course Approaches" Presentation: Kevin Reilly	21
Session 4: "Modernization as a Paradigm: Dead or Alive" Presentations: Joe C. Dixon John Albert Robert Roeder	25
Session 5: "Tools of the Trade: Available Resources" Presentations: Marilyn Hitchens Robert Roeder	31
Session 6: "The Ultimate Challenge: Teaching World History" Presentation: John M. Thompson	37
Appendix A: Academic Survey, USAFA Class of 1987	41
Appendix B: History 101 Honors Syllabus, Fall 1980 U.S. Air Force Academy	43
Appendix C: History 101 Syllabus, Fall 1982 U.S. Air Force Academy	49
Appendix D: History 101 Syllabus, Fall 1983 U.S. Air Force Academy	57
Appendix E: World History Syllabus, Denver 1983 University of Denver	63
Appendix F: "A History of the Past: 'Life Reeked With Joy'" by Anders Henriksson	69
Appendix G: Schematic Outline: Descriptions of Old Regimes Robert Roeder, University of Denver	73
Appendix H: Recommended World History Textbooks (Secondary Level) by Marilyn Hitchens	75
Appendix I: List of 1983 World History Workshop Participants	77

Session 1: "Where are We: World History Today"
Presentations: Major Joe C. Dixon
Professor Kevin Reilly

Opening the session, Major Joe C. Dixon expressed his hope that the 1983 World History Workshop would be an appropriate forum to continue discussion of the many questions presented at the 1982 World History Teaching Conference held at the Air Force Academy. How should "world history" be defined? How can a world history course be organized? Who should teach world history? And why should teachers and students study it? To the latter question, Major Dixon offered his own opinion that Professor William McNeill may have provided the most persuasive answer: citizenship.

In his opening remarks, Professor Kevin Reilly concentrated on the formation and the activities of the World History Association (WHA). Professor Reilly indicated that while the idea to form the association first arose at the American Historical Association (AHA) meeting in Los Angeles in 1981, it really received its impetus at the Air Force Academy's World History Teaching Conference in May, 1982. It was suggested at that conference that an organizational meeting to form the World History Association be held at the 1982 AHA meeting in Washington. On December 28, 1982, the World History Association was established. A steering committee was selected and held a meeting in Racine, Wisconsin in May, 1983. The committee dealt with "nuts and bolts" matters, such as drafting a constitution and selecting officers, but the publication of two newsletters every year was also discussed. Professor Ray Lorantas of Drexel University is serving as editor of the newsletter, which is being published with Drexel University's support. Professor Ross Dunn of San Diego State University agreed to continue collecting course syllabi from different schools with the eventual goal of publishing a representative sample. Professor Reilly also announced that the WHA had two panels accepted for the 1983 AHA meeting in San Francisco. One of the panels stressed research in the field while the other dealt with the teaching of world history.

DISCUSSION

The discussion following the first session was far-ranging and touched on each of the questions raised by Major Dixon in his opening remarks.

While a definition of world history was not specifically debated, it was clear that the participants agreed that "world history is not a presentation of the history of the world." World history demanded compromises on what is taught and how deeply any subject is addressed.

The need to study history in a global context was expressed. The world is a smaller place in today's technological setting; no one can afford the luxury of ignoring parts of the world. Academy participants justified world history because of the Air Force

Academy's unique mission--to prepare military officers for worldwide duty. These specific justifications for a new emphasis on world history, however, were complemented by some traditional arguments for the study of history in general. A secondary school administrator stressed that "critical thinking," not a regurgitation of facts, was the key in a history course. He noted that college admission examinations now emphasize the ability to read and think critically; actual recall questions were few in number.

A cautionary note on eliminating too much of the content in a history course was voiced by one of the Academy's new history instructors. He felt, for example, that he could show a picture of Hitler in his classroom and "fifty percent of the students would be unable to identify him." Another participant pointed to the lack of historical knowledge and a sensitivity to world history in some geographic areas of the United States. He noted that he had passed service stations in Colorado Springs which advertised "U GAS EM!" With the World War II holocaust in mind, he observed that these businesses might encounter problems in cities such as New York or Chicago.

The question of who should teach world history generated considerable discussion. Participants expressed the feeling that on both the secondary and college levels there was a fear of the world history course. How, after all, could any teacher claim to be an expert on everything? On the other hand, the fact that almost every serious teacher of world history had to explore new areas in preparing the course was viewed as extremely rewarding.

Secondary school participants brought out that all too often teaching the world history course, or any history course for that matter, was left for the part-timer with extremely limited expertise. The familiar example is the athletic coach who teaches a history class or two to fulfill his contract.

On the college level the problems are different. Professors hired for their expertise in a particular field do not want to teach a world history course. Others feel that the world history instructor may be invading their special turf. The point was also raised that an aspiring scholar is likely to avoid world history because his success will be measured by contributions in another more specialized area. As one participant expressed it, the "rewards in heaven" go to the specialist.

The last of the questions posed by Major Dixon--how to organize a world history course--was also the subject of some preliminary discussion. As the workshop progressed, this would, indeed, become the primary topic of discussion. The general tenor of this initial discussion was that world history needs some direction, some standardization if it is to succeed or even survive as a course of study.

The secondary school representatives at the workshop expressed concern about the continued existence of world history in the high

school curriculum. References to world history "taking its lumps" and "going out as a required course" were heard. The place of American history seemed secure, but the fate of world history appeared tenuous. While the study of American history was viewed as necessary to "indoctrinate kids," world history is unable to make such a claim. The participants from secondary schools stressed that the community at large plays a greater role in what may or may not be taught than is the case at the university level. Those who see value in world history, then, need to produce a consistent and solid program which convinces the community of its value.

The need for secondary school and college educators to communicate and work together was also stressed. The high school world history teacher looks to the colleges and universities for guidance and leadership. One participant urged that a national or presidential commission was needed to establish guidelines for the teaching of world history.

In the first workshop session basic questions were posed, information on the new World History Association was presented, and participants were quickly involved in a lively exchange of ideas.

Session 2: "Looking for Meaning: Varieties of History"
Presentation: Professor Arnold Schrier

Professor Arnold Schrier, of the University of Cincinnati, the Air Force Academy's Distinguished Visiting Professor, was the speaker at the session. His presentation is best read in its entirety. Professor Schrier examined five major world traditions--the Confucian, Hindu, Jewish, Islamic and Christian--and discussed how each tradition views history.

INTRODUCTION


When I first suggested the title I thought it would be just the thing to cover the topic I had in mind. My plan was to survey briefly some of the major world civilizations to see how each of them has dealt with the concept of history. "Looking for Meaning" seemed an appropriate way to describe that phenomenon.

What I have now come to realize is that the very way I have phrased the title is itself an expression of my own ethnocentrism. We take it for granted that our history--and even world history--has purpose and direction, that it has some goal toward which it is headed. We look for meaning in history because we are convinced that history tells us who we are and what we are. History gives us a way of understanding ourselves. It is our collective biography, after all.

As it turns out, that idea is a peculiarly Western notion. In actuality, some of the world's great civilizations have taken a quite different view. They see the meaning and goal of human existence as being outside of history. I think it is useful for us, as teachers of world history, to have some sense of these very different perspectives. What I plan to do, then, is look briefly at five major traditions: the Confucian, the Hindu, the Jewish, the Islamic and the Christian. I will then conclude with a consideration of how all of this relates to the current treatment of world history. I must confess that to cover so much in so short a time strikes me as wildly ambitious, if not downright pretentious. That makes me uneasy. Since you have all been or are about to become teachers of world history, you know what that feeling is like. So I take comfort in the thought that at least I am speaking to a sympathetic audience.

The Confucian Tradition

Let me begin with the Confucian tradition. From early times there was a considerable amount of written history in China. But in all the written history, there was little reflection on the nature and meaning of history. There was no continued effort to find significance in historical processes and events in any remote goals. Instead, the focus was on the present and the past. To understand the Chinese attitude to history, we have to consider two major sets of early ideas and beliefs. One is Taoism and the other is Confucianism.



Professor Schrier emphasizes how differently various world civilizations can view history.

Tao is usually translated as "the Way." What it really refers to is regularity, especially in the processes of Nature. Throughout their history the masses of Chinese have been occupied with agriculture and handicrafts. Their concern with regularity was therefore a concern with the sequence of the seasons, and with the uniform repetition of the movements of the planets and stars. The Chinese very much felt themselves to be a part of Nature.

That, in turn, led to an attitude of acceptance of the world as it is. These cosmic regularities are beyond anyone's capacity to change. One lives in the world as one finds it. To a Taoist, the Western notion of striving for progress in history would make no sense. The attitude toward history was the same as the attitude toward life--follow nature and don't get involved in anxious or strenuous struggles against it.

This kind of philosophy was a basis for humility and meekness. It was well adapted to the mass of the Chinese people, and also to those thinkers who were not involved in political life.

But the principles of Taoism didn't appeal to everyone. Chinese history is filled with wars and turmoil. It was partly in response to this chaos in the 6th century B.C. that the second great set of ideas arose in China. This was Confucianism. Confucianism has conditioned the basic mentality of the Chinese for more than 2,000 years.

Confucius was disturbed by the constant wars between the feudal states of China. He also wanted changes to improve the governments of his day. In looking for ideas as to what should be done, he went back to the time of the Sage-Kings in China's distant past. He seemed to have no conception of a goal in history that was to be reached through progressive stages.

Since he lived in a period of chaos, Confucius made his main objective harmonious social relations rather than, say, full self-realization of the individual. In his view the good man was always mindful of his obligations rather than his rights. What Confucius emphasized was the supreme importance of ritual, ceremony, propriety. For him, life and history were the empirical experiences of ordinary existence. Confucius had no metaphysical notion of history. He did not consider the meaning of history to be in a state reached beyond this life. He made no attempt to find meaning in anything eternal or "beyond" history. The meaning is in it as it goes along.

Furthermore, Confucianism set no goal for history in a remote future. It stands for a way of life with peace of mind and social harmony in the here and now. The worth of the historical process is the realization in one's own lifetime of the ethical principles of justice, reverence, wisdom and sincerity. This idea has been succinctly summed up by Professor Noah Fehl of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. "Chinese history," says Professor Fehl, "is essentially a moral wisdom and its chief end is the expounding by example of human values in the propriety of correct relations."¹

The Hindu Tradition

If Confucianism is very much this-worldly and present-minded, one of the other great Asian traditions is quite different. Hinduism is metaphysical and oriented toward a far distant future.

China and India are two of the oldest civilizations in the world. Both go back for thousands of years. But in the case of India there is comparatively little in the way of a written historical record. The most noteworthy literature of India has been religious and philosophical. I'm referring, of course, to the great epics. Throughout most of its history the learned men of India have been Brahmins and their interests were religious, not historical.

Serious investigation of the history of India didn't begin until the 19th century. At first it was done mainly by British scholars and then later by Indian scholars. But for our purposes I'm not primarily concerned with the history of the peoples of India. What we really want to know is the dominant attitude toward history. What has been the implication of their lives and beliefs as it concerns the nature of history? What meaning or meanings, if any, have they found in history?

The dominant idea that comes out of the epics is a cyclical conception of history. The epics suggest that in each cycle there are four ages:

- 1) the first is a Golden Age, where all is perfect;
- 2) in the second age, there is a decline of virtue;
- 3) in the third age, disease and sin are widespread;
- 4) the fourth age is the lowest depth of the cycle; suffering predominates and religion is neglected.

At the end of the fourth cycle, all is absorbed into the World Spirit, into Brahman, and the cycle begins all over again. This process of repetition goes on eternally. Right now we are supposedly living in the fourth age and times are pretty bad. Unfortunately, we are not told how long this fourth age is going to last.

In any case, at the time the Upanishads were written, about 900 B.C., there was a good deal of pessimism about existing conditions. History came to be regarded not as having intrinsic significance, but as something to be escaped from.

There is also a marked concern with death in the Upanishads, and with what may come after death. Does human history cease with death? The answer is that humans are not born and they do not die. They are immortal in the realization that they are spirit and therefore eternal. History, on the other hand, is temporal. There

is no significance in the temporal because it is transient, fleeting, ephemeral. It is the eternal that is significant because only that is permanent. One finds redemption not in history but in escape from it.

In this connection, no belief has been more widely or more firmly held in India than the belief in karma. It has been accepted by all schools of Hindu philosophy, all Hindu religious sects, and also by Buddhists.

Simply stated, the law of karma is that a man reaps precisely what he sows. Behavior determines his fate. There is the conviction that the history of human individuals proceeds in accordance with the principle of absolute justice. That principle is not fully realized within any particular history in any one incarnation. Each individual goes through many incarnations. With these reincarnations there is a continuity of consequences of conduct from one life to another.

Now for Westerners like ourselves, the term "History" usually suggests the past. Hindus are not much concerned with the past. History for them is essentially the living present of this incarnation with the expectation of continuance in the future. History, then, is a history of individuals in their series of lives until the ultimate goal is reached, which of course is a state of perfection. At that point reincarnation ceases. So the ultimate goal works out to be an emancipation from history.

From a Westerner's point of view, the practical result of this attitude is a long tradition of historic indifference to the ills of society. After all, if the temporal world is illusion, then there is no important distinction between freedom and slavery, or justice and injustice. As Herbert Muller has pointed out, "Holy men who contemplate with equanimity the birth and death of whole universes, in an endless cycle, will not be troubled by the fate of mere societies." Hence, he concludes, "Indians were not interested in recording their history if only because they had no real interest in improving it."²

The Jewish Tradition

Now when we come to the Jewish, Islamic and Christian traditions and their attitudes toward history, we note a very striking difference between them and Confucianism and Hinduism. Neither Confucianism nor Hinduism is in any way theistic. But it is precisely this element of theism which is the most distinguishing characteristic of the Jewish, Islamic and Christian traditions.

Let me deal first with the Jewish tradition. Jewish ideas concerning the nature of history are expressed in Hebrew Scriptures. The historical character of most of those writings demonstrate the extent to which the Jews have been interested in their history. For example, the order in which the Scriptures are put together suggests a historical sequence from what was taken to

be the beginning of mankind. Then there are the contents of the historical books and the way in which they are presented. These show that the Jews were interested in something more than any mere record of events. Much more important was the interpretation of events and the implied relations with God.

The Jewish view of history, then, is basically and comprehensively theistic. History has to be understood in relation to the idea of the dominance of God. The fundamental idea of the Book of Genesis is that the beginning of human history was due to God. He created the earth with all its characteristics that make history possible on it. He also created human beings who have both souls and bodies, and He placed them in conditions of bliss, in the Garden of Eden.

But there is evil in history and the story of the fall of Adam and Eve explains the origin of evil. Now the story of Adam and Eve implies two ideas that have persisted in the Jewish view of history. They are that man has a freedom of choice either to obey or to disobey God. The root evil is disobedience, which leads to alienation from God. But even though God turned Adam and Eve out of the Garden of Eden, He did not forever after isolate Himself from mankind. The Jews insist that God has maintained His relationship with men in history. Indeed, on particular occasions in history, God has intervened.

The Jewish conception of God is of fundamental importance in understanding the Jewish view of history. God is a spirit and there can be no visible representation of Him. Yet God made man "in His own image." Therefore man is also a spirit. Since there is a similarity of being between God and man, similar terms can be used for both. God has wisdom and will, and feelings such as love and righteous anger. But the Jews have not confused or identified God with what God has created. Neither the physical world nor human beings are parts of God.

The Israelites came to believe that they were "the chosen people" of God. The historical books recorded what God had done to them and for them. God made a covenant with Abraham. He blessed the Israelites and through them he blessed all the families of the earth. In a specific event in history, God gave the law to Moses. For the Jews, that event involved a principle that was fundamental for their view of history. Morality was not invented by men; it was not simply a social product relative to changing conditions of life. Morality was conformity with God's will. Its principles were valid always and everywhere. It was God who revealed the moral to men; men did not discover it for themselves. That was one of the main aspects of God's purpose in creating them and the intelligible world. God was a righteous judge and the Scriptures indicated some of his judgments as it went along.

Unlike Hinduism, the Jewish conception of history has never been individualistic. It is a conception of history that relates primarily to "the people of Israel" and then to mankind in general. The kings, as vice-regents of God on earth, were to promote the

welfare of God's chosen people. The prophets preached righteousness and devotion to God.

The Hebrew Scriptures did not advocate an "escape from the world" in any forms of ascetic monastic life. The goods of earthly life are gifts from God. They were to be accepted with thankfulness and enjoyed. Clearly, the attitude implied is very much this-worldly. But there is no notion of a hedonistic conception of history. After all, there is much suffering in history. The purpose of this suffering is to strengthen men's character and to turn them to God. This Jewish view is in contrast to the Indian doctrine of the law of karma.

The modern version of this Jewish view of history has been pretty well summed up by a 20th-century Jewish scholar named Claude Montefiore. "God," he says, "controls and has a purpose for the history of man. Terrestrial history has intrinsic worth and it is also a preparation for a future life, a messianic age." "Meanwhile," says Montefiore, "for His purposes in history God gives particular peoples and individuals different capacities and tasks." "It is in this sense," he insists, "that the Jews are 'a chosen people.'" "They are not chosen in order to acquire prosperity or power or numbers. Nor are they chosen for the sake of art or science or philosophy." "Rather," he concludes, "they are chosen to learn and to help in diffusing true doctrine and experience about God and righteousness, and the relations of man to God and God to man."³

In short, this is the idea of history as a moral order. Both of the other major theistic traditions, Islam and Christianity, adopted this idea. In that way, Judaism contributed to Islam and Christianity a historic tradition that made all life purposeful and made all history meaningful.

The Islamic Tradition

At the core of all three traditions are the sacred books in which the basic beliefs are set down. In the case of the Muslims it is the Koran. The Koran was influenced not only by the traditional Jewish faith but by the Christian faith as well, as both became known to Muhammad in the 7th century. Orthodox Muslims, of course, believe the Koran was entirely revealed by God. It is the perfect and final revelation for mankind.

The central idea of the Koran, and of Islam, is belief in Allah, God. The Islamic conception of history derives from this central idea. The main purpose of the Koran is to draw men to an awareness of their relations to God. One can never get away from God in history.

But God has not come into history as an incarnate being. The Koran rejects the doctrine that Jesus was God incarnate. Moses and Jesus were prophets, and Hebrew and Christian scriptures were revelations at their own level. Muhammad was the last and the greatest of the prophets. From that time on, mankind is to get its

guidance in history from the Koran and from personal communion with God in prayer. It follows, then, that the chief turning point in history was in the revelation of the Koran.

God created the physical world and that of course made human history possible and significant. But the world of nature is not fixed once and for all. God may continuously create. In creating day and night, He has made life for mankind temporal. Time, as men experience it, is real for them and for God. He created humans as souls and gave them bodies for this life. God has special consideration for humans. He made man His representative on earth. In their hearts men may come into spiritual relation with God.

But Islam doesn't focus only on the individual. It also pays attention to the social group. God judges nations. Cities have advanced or been destroyed depending on whether they conformed to the moral principles expressed in the Koran. Each people eventually gets what it deserves, for God rules mankind with righteousness.

In this sense the Islamic attitude toward history is based on the belief that the world can get better. If individuals and peoples increasingly conform to God's will as expressed in the Koran, things will improve. This provides impetus to Islam as a proselytizing faith and the implication is that eventually Islam will triumph everywhere.

There has been a large amount of historical writing among Muslims. These historical writers have been interested in the lives of their leaders, both religious and secular, in their wars, and in the establishment of their political power. One of the most important Muslim historians was a 14th-century scholar named Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406; born in Tunis). He has been called the founder of the science of history because he maintained that history is a specific body of knowledge. For him history was not simply a record of events but a description of internal and external relationships.

What is particularly interesting is that Ibn Khaldun's treatment of history was not explicitly elaborated from the standpoint of Islamic theism. He did not suggest that there is a divine purpose in history, and he did not concern himself with any idea of an ultimate goal. Whether people persevered and progressed depended on how well they utilized their own special strengths and abilities.

The modern Muslim idea of the nature and meaning of history is more theistic than that of Ibn Khaldun. One representative of this modern Muslim attitude is Mohammed Iqbal, who was a native of India and wrote in the 1930s (Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, 1930). For Iqbal, the chief aim and value in history is the religious communion with God. History is an affair of individuals. Man is a self-conscious being and has to take the risk of conflicts with others. Iqbal stressed individual spontaneity. The term "creation," he said, has meaning for us only because we ourselves

have the capacity to initiate action. And God, of course, is continuously creative. This means that from an Islamic point of view history is a dynamic process.

Nevertheless, Iqbal did not think of history as an advance towards a fixed or predetermined goal. He thought that any such idea was in opposition to the continuity of the free creativity of both God and man. In his view, nothing is more alien to the outlook of the Koran than the idea that the universe is the temporal working out of a preconceived plan. What is important is the belief that the Divine wisdom is continuous in God's creative process and that there may be a spiritual conformity of man with Divine goodness.

Iqbal concluded that the significance of history is in this world and the next. The Koran gives men guidance for it, a knowledge of all the fundamentals for achieving human good in its entirety. "In view of the basic idea of Islam," he said, "there can be no further revelation binding on men."⁴

The Christian Tradition

The third great theistic conception of history that I want to consider is Christianity. One of the distinctive features of the Christian view is that the Fall of Adam resulted in the contamination of mankind by sin. It was therefore necessary for the salvation of men that God should come as man into history, in the person of Jesus. It is this doctrine of an incarnation of God that constitutes the basic difference between Christianity and the theistic traditions of the Jews and Muslims as they relate to history. The attitudes and teachings of Jesus concerning history are therefore of utmost significance for Christians because they are believed to be expressions of divine revelation.

All types of Christianity have included the belief that God is intimately concerned with history. And all have acknowledged spiritual continuance beyond earthly life. The goal of history has come to be predominantly thought of as lying in a future life. This belief is associated with the ideas of a general resurrection and a day of judgment at the end of history.

The Christian idea of the nature of history was more fully developed by St. Augustine (354-430 A.D.). According to Augustine, history is concerned both with the temporal and the eternal. God is eternal and he creates time. Within human history God is providence. The affairs of earthly history, said Augustine, "are ruled and governed by the one God as He pleases." God "can never be believed to have left the kingdoms of men . . . outside the laws of providence."⁵ Human kingdoms are established by providence; they are not fortuitous or of necessity. There is to be a final judgment and although we may not always be able to discern it, God's judgment is present in the web of human affairs.

By the time we get to the Middle Ages, history was conceived primarily as a time of trial and of preparation for a life after

death. Perhaps the best expression of the medieval Christian view of history can be found in Dante's (1265-1321) Divine Comedy. Human history is not limited to earth; it goes beyond earth to future conditions of hell, purgatory and paradise. Even though men may be associated in groups for good or evil, their spiritual attitudes and acts of conduct are products of their individual wills. The principle of justice runs through the whole of the Divine Comedy.

The traditional Christian view of history did not change significantly either during the Renaissance or the Protestant Reformation. Luther and Calvin continued to hold the view that life on earth is a preparation for the life to come. It is true, of course, that Protestants have promoted attention to earthly affairs, but they have not sought the meaning of history in the temporal flow of events. God is in history primarily for the spiritual welfare of individuals. Calvin did encourage diligence in one's calling, but he also demanded simplicity of life and abstention from luxuries. Worldly success depends on God.

Ultimately what Luther and Calvin sought to do was stress the idea that man's spiritual salvation depends far more on God than on man himself. It is a fundamental element of Christian theism that God in history does more for the well-being of man, both physically and spiritually, than men do.

In the 18th and 19th centuries, the Enlightenment and the theory of evolution provided strong impetus for a belief in human progress. This belief was reinforced by great advances in industry and commerce, and an enormous increase in wealth. But the First World War undermined confidence in the progress of mankind. Among Christian leaders there was great emphasis on the wickedness of mankind, and an insistence that the only salvation was that of redemption through Christ.

The Second World War strengthened the sense of the crisis in human history due to man's wickedness. No ideas of human civilization seemed adequate to deal with that evil. The result is that since the end of World War II there has been a dominant presentation of Christian ideas on history in terms of traditional orthodoxy. In particular, the emphasis has been on the dogmas of Original Sin and of redemption through Christ.

One of the foremost leaders of Christianity who expounded this Christian view of history was Reinhold Niebuhr (1892-1971). He presented his views in a book called Faith and History which he published in 1949. Niebuhr was not writing as a professional historian; he was a Christian preacher. Among professional historians, this view has been best expressed by Christopher Dawson and Herbert Butterfield. In 1949 Butterfield published a book called Christianity and History. Let me briefly indicate his main ideas.

"History," says Butterfield, "is a human drama . . . taking place as it were on the stage of Nature." Furthermore, it is a

drama "of human life as the affair of individual personalities possessing self-consciousness, intellect and freedom." Technical history, he insists, does not acquaint men with the meaning of life. Mundane history is not self-explanatory. Nevertheless, it does show that whether one believes in God as providence or not, there is a sort of providential order in history-making that goes beyond what men consciously intend and deliberately strive for. Technical history gives us evidence of the defective knowledge among men. In this sense, he says, history uncovers "man's universal sin."⁶ Butterfield insists that this is a fact of history and not merely a Christian idea.

Butterfield then goes on to argue that the whole interpretation of the universe and of history depends on whether one believes in God or not. That belief does not rest on technical history, nor even on philosophy. "I am unable," he says, "to see how a man can find the hand of God in secular history, unless he has first found that he has an assurance of it in his personal experience." Though God as providence in history must be "capable of bringing good out of evil," God does not guarantee progress. We should "conceive ourselves not as sovereign makers of history but as born to cooperate with providence," which has the last word about the results. With this belief in God, says Butterfield, we will "envisage our history in the proper light, if we say that each generation--indeed, each individual--exists for the glory of God."

Western Historians and World History

Unlike Butterfield, most professional historians in the Western world do not practice their discipline from a Christian theistic point of view. But they do look for meaning in history. That is the legacy they have inherited from the Judeo-Christian tradition. However, instead of seeing the unifying factor in history as the working out of divine providence, the prevalent tendency among Western historians is to focus on man's conflict with his environment as the central theme. This broadly materialist position has been adopted by historians like William McNeill, Leften Stavrianos and Cyril Black.

There are several reasons why such an interpretation has wide appeal. For one thing, an interpretation whose central theme is the growth of man's control over his environment implies an organizing principle which is common to the whole of mankind. Second, it establishes a measurable criterion for progress and direction, without which--at least for the great majority of people in the West--world history would be meaningless. Third, it provides the historian with a standard for deciding what is and what is not important from a global perspective. In particular, it shifts the emphasis from events on a national or local level, which affect only one people or ethnic group, to broad movements which involve the whole of mankind. One example of this would be the Neolithic agricultural revolution.

Of course the assumptions underlying this structure of world history also have some limitations. Certainly no one would

question the fact that mankind as a species is everywhere basically the same. But the relevant question is whether this is true of man as a social and historical being. Furthermore, as I have tried to point out, the very idea that world history has purpose, direction and a goal, is a peculiarly Western tradition. We've seen that a number of the world's great civilizations have taken a different view; they see the meaning and goal of human existence outside of history.

One may also question the theme expressed by Leften Stavrianos that "the story of man from its very beginnings has a basic unity that must be recognized and respected."⁸ It may be true that all human groups everywhere are motivated from the start by the need to cope with the material facts of life. But this is a tenuous basis for assuming that their historical development is, or can plausibly be reconstructed as, a single unitary process, a sort of linear development.

The foremost proponent of a linear and unitary view of history is William McNeill. For him, "interactions across relatively large distances even in very ancient times are sufficient to make mankind's history a single, if loosely articulated whole." But even McNeill, at the very beginning of his text, A World History (1967), concedes that the Neolithic agricultural revolution, which allegedly began in the Middle East and spread from there to Europe, India, China and parts of Africa, may have been less than universal. He admits that "the Americas, monsoon Asia, and West Africa may have seen the independent inauguration of agriculture."⁹ With all due respect to McNeill, it seems reasonable to conclude that on present evidence what McNeill calls "the segmented, pluralistic view of the human past" cannot be rejected out of hand. As a matter of fact, the current tendency among pre-historians is to question and reject the diffusionist theory of the origins of civilization. (See Glyn E. Daniel, The First Civilizations, Crowell, 1968).

There is another objection to this diffusionist interpretation of world history, that is, to a conception that sees the unifying thread as the spread of culture and cultural innovation from one or more centers. The objection is that such an approach views history as a progressive movement leading by stages to the contemporary world. Now, since the contemporary world has largely been shaped by the West, it results in a marked Western ethnocentrism. It may be subconscious but it nevertheless centers on the belief that the social forms developed in Europe (including Russia) and North America during the present century are in some sense the "goal" towards which history has been working. Cyril Black, in fact, is unequivocal on this point, as we found out at the 1982 World History Conference here at the Academy. But it is doubtful that historians in other parts of the world are likely to accept that theme as the last word in world history. Some forty years ago, when Jawaharlal Nehru wrote his Glimpses of World History (N.Y., 1942) while in a British jail, he took it for granted that a world historian would be concerned chiefly with Asia.

These kinds of criticisms are leading a growing number of historians to question the assumptions of the most recent attempts to write world history. They argue that the "linear" conception of world history, whether it is the diffusionist approach of McNeill and Stavrianos or the modernization approach of Cyril Black, is, in Geoffrey Barraclough's words, "stultifying and misconceived."¹⁰

Craig Lockard points out that the modernization theory "fails to explain adequately the complex interconnections and interactions of societies working through various international networks and processes." "Instead," he says, "it encourages a bland ethnocentrism which develops little sympathy or understanding among Americans for the aspirations and plight of Third World peoples."¹¹

Two Indian historians have called upon their colleagues to "discard the unitary view of civilization" and "accept the irreducible plurality of civilizations." They have stressed the need to "abandon the concept of center and periphery" and replace it by "a concept of the multi-focal growth of human civilization."¹²

The implication of these critiques is that the subject-matter of world history is not the sequence of civilizations but rather the study of the differences between different countries, areas and civilizations, and of their interactions. Craig Lockard calls for an approach that he says would help students understand that "the world consists of interdependent units of uneven influence and power."¹³

This position has been most eloquently summed up by Geoffrey Barraclough. Let me close with a quotation from him because in many ways my own views on world history are moving in that direction. "World history in its contemporary connotation," says Barraclough, "is not a synthesis of known fact or a juxtaposition of the histories of different continents or cultures; arranged in some sort of order of relative importance; rather it is a search for the links and connections across political and cultural frontiers. It is concerned not so much with development in time or with the goal and meaning of history--Western preoccupations which non-Western cultures for the most part do not share--as with the perennial problems which have assailed mankind everywhere and with the different responses to them." "This," he concludes, "is the stuff of world history."¹⁴

NOTES

1. Noah Edward Fehl, ed., Sir Herbert Butterfield, Cho Yun Hsu and William H. McNeill on Chinese and World History (Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1971), p. 5.
2. Herbert J. Muller, The Uses of the Past (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953), pp. 334-5.
3. Claude Montefiore, Outlines of Liberal Judaism, in Interpretations of History from Confucius to Toynbee, ed. Alban G. Widgery (London: Allen and Unwin, 1917), p. 105.
4. Widgery, p. 113.
5. Widgery, p. 119.
6. Widgery, p. 138.
7. Widgery, p. 138.
8. L. S. Stavrianos, The World to 1500--A Global History, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1982), p. XII.
9. William H. McNeill, A World History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p.3.
10. Geoffrey Barraclough, Main Trends in History (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1978), p. 162.
11. Craig A. Lockard, "Global History, Modernization and the World-System Approach: A Critique," The History Teacher, 14, No.4 (1981), p. 498.
12. Barraclough, p. 162.
13. Lockard, p. 504.
14. Barraclough, pp. 162-3.

DISCUSSION

The discussion session began with reactions to Professor Schrier's concluding remarks. While there was agreement that world history teachers must attempt to appreciate civilizations on their own terms, Professor Schrier admitted that men cannot totally divest themselves of ethnocentrism. Indeed, it was Professor Schrier's view that we should not ignore our own culture and its values.

When questioned about the goals of world history, Professor Schrier agreed that citizenship in an ever-shrinking world was surely valid. He also stressed that toleration, learning to live with one another, is very important. Professor Schrier feels that many American students are still "in a very provincial mode" and a world history course would serve to broaden their horizons.

The secondary school participants here expressed a need for a solid justification for administrators and school boards when mentioning a world history program. Some participants pointed to evidence of increasing interest in world history--attendance at the 1982 World History Teaching Conference and a number of world history textbook advertisements for example--and noted that this interest might also be used by world history advocates. When a participant objected to giving an "everybody's doing it" pitch, a secondary school teacher wryly suggested that this was "probably the best one."

Another topic discussed was the changing role of university history departments and their students. For years history departments viewed their primary function as training graduate students. Closely related to this function was recruiting the undergraduate history major. Professor Schrier and some of the participants perceive a major change taking place in this set of priorities, primarily due to the declining market for the history Ph.D. Professor Schrier sees a time when the primary role of the university may be to provide the "vital service" of teaching world history in some form to a large cross-section of undergraduate students for a year. Reference was made to the forecast of a declining undergraduate population in the next decade and to the statistics which indicate that more and more high school students are attending community colleges where world history appears to be more popular. These developments could pressure the universities to take a closer look at their programs.

Despite the perception of an increasing demand for a world history course, at least at the university level, one participant pointed out that very little is being done to prepare future instructors to teach the course. In doing some personal research, he could find only three schools which required some preparation in world history at the M.A. or Ph.D. levels. Another participant felt that there never would be a "world history major." Instead, the student with interest in world history would probably have an area speciality as well as preparation in world history.

What the secondary school world history course should include was another question discussed. Not all secondary school students go on to college--should there be different world history courses? There was a call to integrate secondary school and college programs to present a logical progression and avoid duplication. The discussants agreed that little is being done in this area. It was, however, also mentioned that the opportunity for coordination in American history has existed for years with very little being done. One participant suggested that a Western civilization course might be best at the secondary school level. Others objected; the awareness gained in even an elementary world history course would be more beneficial than a Western civilization course.

Professor Schrier related an incident that occurred during a high school teachers training program. A high school teacher asked the university expert on China what he would suggest be taught in a high school course which could devote two or three weeks to Chinese history. The expert's answer, "I don't know," appalled Dr. Schrier, for here was an opportunity for the expertise of the university to make a direct impact on a secondary school program. In this instance, however, the chance was lost.

Another participant recalled a question he had asked Professor William McNeill at the Academy's 1982 World History Teaching Conference. When questioned about what the secondary school teacher could do to prepare students in world history, Professor McNeill had responded, "teach them where things are on a map." While most would agree that a knowledge of geography is an important and valid objective in a world history course, it is obvious that others at the workshop felt such an objective was insufficient. One participant pointed to a study which indicated that seventh grade students are on a par with eleventh grade students when it comes to understanding concepts. This would indicate that we sometimes sell young students short in what they are able to understand and grasp. Another participant humorously expressed some confusion at this point--he wasn't sure whether he should discuss nationalism or "where Paris is."

Professor Schrier concluded the day's discussion by stressing that the effectiveness of any course, no matter what the objectives, ultimately depends on the effectiveness of the teacher. Good teachers produce good courses.

Session 3: "Putting it Together: Course Approaches"
Presentation: Kevin Reilly

Professor Reilly began his presentation by suggesting three purposes for a world history course (or, for that matter, any history course): citizenship, critical thinking, and finally, the training of historians. He then presented various course approaches.

Professor Reilly first noted a technique used in a course in one of the physical sciences. On the first day of class the students received an article from a professional journal. This one article was the basis for the entire course. With this approach the students would start with very specific knowledge and then branch out into more general areas. Very close examination of the article would necessarily be supplemented by background work and readings to increase their understanding. Professor Reilly was not familiar with any history course which used this method but felt that it had possibilities, especially if the goal of the course was to teach analytical skills.

Another possibility was to construct a course similar to the Western civilization readings course developed at Amherst in the 1960s. One primary goal of such a course is to get students to enjoy reading history. A great historical work on a particular subject is the initial reading assignment; on the French Revolution, for example, Alexis De Tocqueville's Ancien Régime might be appropriate. Other works on the same subject or time period are then read to supplement the original reading. Professor Reilly admitted that such a thorough and detailed course probably was beyond the scope of most instructors present at the workshop. As an alternative, he proposed using a film which gives a historical interpretation. The recent films Gandhi and Reds were cited as examples. After viewing and discussing the film, students would then be asked to read appropriate works on the subject. This pattern of films and readings could be adapted for a variety of topics.

The final course model discussed was a Western civilization course developed at Carnegie-Mellon University. This course is divided into two semesters, the first entitled "State and Society, 1500 to Present," and the second "Applied History." Professor Reilly described the first semester as "somewhat more conventional," dealing with the development of the state and its interaction with society. The second semester of this model was more interesting. Designed for the "future technocrats" studying at Carnegie-Mellon, the course stresses research skills and study of policy issues such as pollution, education, and nutrition. Again, Professor Reilly realized that this course was not a real possibility for most members of his audience. What he did feel could be utilized by world history instructors was the topical approach. Rather than being aimed at the technocrat or manager, a course examining a wide variety of topics could stress thinking skills and citizenship. Professor Reilly listed possible topics: war, city life, sexism, racism, ecology, individuality and politi-

cal morality. Such a course would use a text which deals with issues topically as well as a source book or books. In conclusion, Professor Reilly stressed that the goal is to get students to think about the issues from a historical perspective. It is imperative, for instance, that students realize that "ecology is not an issue that was created and passed last week."



Professor Reilly discusses the purposes of world history and suggests some different approaches.

DISCUSSION

Discussion revolved around three questions: the value of film and other audio-visual materials in the classroom; topical versus narrative approaches in teaching; and the problems associated with appealing to a student audience of varied ability.

While most participants appeared to agree with Professor Reilly that film can be a valuable teaching tool, there were questions as to its effective utilization. Films are expensive and absorb a great deal of the instructor's class time. Professor Reilly agreed that these are real problems, but he felt that cassette technology may soon be an aid to instructors. In terms of the length of most feature films, he said that he would offer evening viewings and release students from some regular class periods.

There were other objections to the use, and overuse, of films in the classroom. One instructor expressed a wariness of using too much film, not wanting to "spoil his students." He was especially concerned about overstressing film to "a generation that doesn't like to read." Professor Reilly understood the viewpoint but suggested that the films be supplemented with readings and classroom work. He also felt historians must accept reality: "twenty years from now the students' view of history would be based on film more than books or what instructors have said."

Professor John Thompson, playing the devil's advocate, wondered how Professor Reilly responds to those who claim that using film is an "intellectually shoddy" teaching method. Professor Thompson recalled presenting a course on contemporary civilization that was based on twenty-five films. When he approached his colleagues to give some background information in their field of expertise, only two of forty-four volunteered. The rest rejected the course due to its format. In reply Professor Reilly again pointed to the quality of films being produced today, and he noted that there is a much greater effort at accuracy than in the past. While film was just one tool to be used with readings and lectures, he first wanted to get the student's interest. He also questioned how efficient traditional methods have been. Professor Reilly pointed out that the producers of the film Gandhi did a survey on people's knowledge of this prominent figure in history and discovered that eighty percent of those interviewed did not know who he was.

Some of the secondary school instructors raised the question of how to properly use film. While understanding the values of film, they had seen teachers rush to get whatever is available on a subject and substitute the film for good teaching. It was stressed, then, that proper preparation is necessary for any audio-visual materials to be effective. The materials must have a purpose and be integrated into a total lesson plan. Time must always be set aside to discuss the audio-visual materials, and the teacher should be mentally prepared to field the most unlikely questions, far from the profound points he has in mind. It was also pointed out that films and other audio-visual material may not

have the expected impact. Today's student has been bombarded with media. Indeed, one instructor warned of "professional film sleepers."

The second main area of discussion during this session centered around the topical approach, advocated by Professor Reilly, versus the more traditional narrative approach. It was pointed out that many persons, both in and out of the academic community, feel that it is necessary for the student to learn as many of the facts as possible. Professor Reilly objected to the view, noting that it is impossible to relate all the facts for any single year in history, let alone to teach all that happened in world history. For him, there are "no basic facts." It is more important to examine trends and themes than to attempt a chronological account. Again, he stressed that because many of the topics that he would choose (war, sexism, racism in history, for example) have interest for the student, they are items the student will pursue.

One participant suggested, however, that in using a topical approach, the history instructor may be moving away from history. What was different from the topical approach and what a sociology instructor might do? Professor Reilly countered that there was certainly a difference in approaches. The historian attempts to understand change through time. He emphasized that his examination of topics begins in the ancient world. When the participant suggested that some sociologists attempt to teach within a historical framework, Professor Reilly said that he was elated to see a recognition of the value of the historical method.

Another participant noted that the goal of world history teachers (and the World History Association) ought to be to offer alternatives. At some institutions, the topical approach might be best. At others, the chronological approach might be necessary. The goal ought to be to offer the best of all alternative approaches.

A third discussion topic was how to deal with a student audience of varied ability. One participant felt that what he was hearing at the session was that the instructor must aim at "the lowest common denominator" in the classroom. If students don't read, show them films; if students are bored with facts, discuss issues. The reaction from many participants was that a teacher must never focus his lesson on the least capable student; the instructor's job is to elevate all of his students. On the other hand, the instructor must be aware that he has an audience of varied abilities. He must be concerned with all of the students and, hopefully, attain a widespread interest. One participant compared the teacher's role in the classroom to a novel that can be read at different levels. Some students will remain at a basic level of understanding, but there must be something in each lesson which can also peak the interest of the superior student.

Session 4: "Modernization as a Paradigm: Dead or Alive?"

Presentations: Major Joe C. Dixon

Captain John Albert

Professor Robert Roeder

Moderator: Professor John M. Thompson

Major Dixon and Captain Albert opened the session by explaining how the Academy arrived at the theme of modernization for its own world history course.

The Academy first used the modernization theme in the fall of 1980 in its world history honors sections with a total of about ninety students. As chairman of the course, Major Dixon wanted to do something different and provide something more challenging for his students. His goals were to teach what happened, to give some preparation for citizenship in the world, and to get his students to think.

Major Dixon selected Civilization: Past and Present by Wallbank and Taylor primarily for its quality essays. But to tie all of the material together, and to make sense out of the varied essays, he felt that a theme was needed. For Major Dixon, the theme of modernization would be "a kind of glue to hold the course together." That original 1980 syllabus (see appendix B) explained the purpose of the modernization theme in the following manner:

Anything so diverse and complicated as the history of mankind needs an organizational principle or theme to reduce it to manageable proportions. The major theme or thread which ties this course together is the concept of modernization.

The syllabus then proceeded to define modernization by contrasting traditional and modern societies. While the traditional society was static and religious-oriented, modern society tended to be secular, specialized, and constantly changing. Additionally, modern society was proud of its mastery over the physical environment, preached that society and government should conform to rational criteria, and was machine-oriented. Major Dixon acknowledged that there were problems with the modernization theme, noting that "as we continue to add to our list of modern characteristics, it is easy to suspect that the term 'modern' is so broad and all-inclusive that it really means nothing at all. Indeed, some scholars have argued persuasively that a precise 'scientific' definition of modernization is impossible." Thus, Major Dixon felt that the approach continued to raise questions of definition, interpretation, and organization. On the positive side, the course was flexible and permitted instructors to deal with topical issues with some sense of order.

As an aid to department members in working with the new concept, Professor Cyril Black was invited to the Academy in October of 1981. His visit was pivotal in the department's decision to try the modernization theme. He helped with the definition of modernization as well as in the development of a

syllabus. Professor Black's definition of modernization was simple: it is a process of moving from a traditional to a modern culture. Professor Black stressed that modernization was not necessarily good or bad--it was rather a process of change with mixed results.

But what was traditional and what was modern? Basically, Professor Black saw traditional society as having a sacred outlook, an agrarian economy, a rural setting adapting to the environment, and stability while only experiencing gradual change. A modern society, on the other hand, had a rational and scientific outlook, an industrial economy, an urban setting, controlled its environment, and experienced growth and rapid change. While Professor Black's model was basically accepted by the department, it was never viewed as sacrosanct and, historically, this is certainly true. The department continually refined Professor Black's ideas.

Captain Albert was one of the first instructors at the Academy to chair the regular world history course (vice the honors course) using the modernization theme. His task was different. Instead of ninety specially selected students, his audience would be five to six hundred freshmen cadets. Teaching the course would be five or six new instructors rather than one old hand.

Captain Albert began his presentation by again stressing that there were good practical reasons for Academy cadets to take world history, led by the desire to make them the best possible second lieutenants for an Air Force deployed worldwide.

In dealing with the Academy world history program, one limitation existed from the start. The course is only one semester; many other colleges have two semesters of world history. Given the limitation, the twentieth century must be emphasized. This was one reason why the department discarded Leften Stavrianos' The World Since 1500; Stavrianos' coverage of the twentieth century was too brief. Instructors had also been uncomfortable with Stavrianos' "laps around the world" which is hard to avoid in world history, where one examines China in 1500, China in 1800, and so on. A pedagogical goal in the new course was to organize consecutive lessons on each region in order to provide a coherent package for the student. To accomplish this, supplemental readings were integrated with the text. Tony Howarth's Twentieth Century History: The World Since 1900, Yang and Lazzerini's The Chinese World, William Miller's The Japanese World, and a twentieth century issues volume provided some of the material; other essays were written by members of the department (see Appendices C and D to contrast Fall 1982 and Fall 1983 World History Syllabi).

Captain Albert noted that the modernization model might still need clarification. For example, he challenged a popular view of modernization--that it must include urbanization. He conjectured for instance, that in Asia, some societies may not urbanize but may instead turn to "microplots," where a peasant farmer uses modern technology on a small (two-acre) plot of land to help feed the city

populace as well as his family. For Captain Albert, this possibility does not mean that the modernization theory is wrong, but rather "our understanding of what the process is all about . . ." may be erroneous.

Captain Albert stressed that a key to understanding the modernization process is the growth of modern knowledge. As he put it ". . . once you have knowledge you cannot put it back in the bottle. Once you know how to control the atom, you know how to control the atom." It is irrelevant whether one is happy with the new knowledge--it is there and will be used in some way. It is in this sense, the growth of modern knowledge, that Captain Albert understands Professor Black when he says that modernization is inevitable.

Professor Robert Roeder of the University of Denver was the last speaker at this session. Professor Roeder has also adopted the modernization theme for world history courses at the University of Denver. Like others, however, he has added unique touches to the modernization model. The desire to have a pattern in history led him in the direction of modernization.

Professor Roeder views modern society in terms of capacities rather than institutions. The capacities which Professor Roeder views as basic for modern society are the following:

- 1) the ability to use non-muscular energy in productive processes and thereby achieve long-sustained per capita income growth.
- 2) the ability to apply rational calculation pervasively throughout society.
- 3) the ability to mobilize human and material resources massively, rapidly, and flexibly.

In what he refers to as an "emergent scenario," Professor Roeder has developed a course which uses these basic modern capacities as its connecting thread (the syllabus for this course appears as Appendix E). He prefers to think of modernization as a scenario or pattern rather than a model because in his view, strict social/scientific models are inappropriate for studying world history. There are six areas of the world that invite examination under Professor Roeder's scenario: China, Japan, the Mogul empire in India and its successors, the Ottoman empire in the Middle East with its successors, Russia, and northwest Europe. In 1600, these societies comprised 75% of the world's population; in 1800, 80%; today, two-thirds of the world's population. Furthermore, these areas include the large metropolitan power centers of the world.

While declaring himself a recent convert to the modernization theme, Professor Roeder readily admitted that there have been problems with the paradigm. First of all, students tended to glorify modernization if, indeed, they "understood it all." Second, many modernization theories tended to be

ethnocentric, even ideological in character. Finally, many of the previous models, in Professor Roeder's opinion, attempted too much. He reminded his audience how difficult it is to explain world events over two centuries.

But the positive side of the theory was also stressed by Professor Roeder. Modernization has produced "the conception that something has happened in the last couple of centuries which has produced a new and significant form of human society which is greatly different from that which existed in the previous five millennia." It has "in its clumsy and imprecise way" emphasized that the modern world is a new kind of society. And, as Professor Roeder pointed out, modernization does have the advantage of being "damn vague." In a very real sense, the theory is making a contribution here. Unlike industrialization which tends to limit the scope of one's study to the production process, modernization opens the door to all sorts of causes and effects.



Professor Robert Roeder discusses his treatment of the modernization paradigm.

DISCUSSION

The first question posed by the discussants concerned the problem of students viewing "modern" as good, while "traditional" societies are seen as bad. Both Major Dixon and Professor Roeder stressed that they emphasize to their students that such judgements are not the point of the modernization theory. Professor Roeder felt that neither traditional nor modern society should be glorified. In the case of traditional society, he believed that if you just describe that lifestyle in objective terms, you need not evaluate it. Students "will reject it" merely on objective grounds. Captain Albert also pointed out that the Academy course stresses that there is no completely modern or completely traditional society. To make his point, Captain Albert noted that he often asks cadets to take out a coin and read what it says. The words "In God We Trust" have little to do with empirical and scientific thought. His point is that a "modern" society can have many traditional values.

Professor Thompson related some of his experiences with the "good" vs. "bad" question on modernization. Pollution is an issue that works very well, for it demonstrates that not everything that is modern is good. Indeed, here we have one of the banes of modern society that all can agree is not good. Another product of the modern world, the automobile, was also used. How many people were killed yearly in automobile accidents, and how many were killed in Vietnam? In Professor Thompson's view the tendency for students to think that modernization must be good is a real one; teachers must skillfully deal with it.

Another participant felt it was unfair to blame students for their view that modernization was positive. By its very nature, he argued, the theory evaluates some societies as advanced in rational thought. Were the other societies irrational or were they merely thinking in terms which are unfamiliar in the West?

Professor Reilly questioned whether modernization models really offered a useful perspective, or whether modernization really told us anything about the dynamics of change. Industrialization or imperialism contributed to an understanding of change--but did modernization contribute anything? As Reilly put it, he found it "... more valuable to find reasons for why things happened than to just pose the paradigm."

Others felt that modernization models were not accurate. China became a point of contention. In terms of coal production, for example, China might well have preceded the West as the world's first industrial power. Others pointed out, however, that even if this were true it is only one aspect of a modern society. The obvious answer to this is that the categories have been artificially devised to exclude China. Another participant pointed out that what the West calls "primitive people" are not necessarily irrational--they have very rational patterns of thinking but do not agree with our presumptions. Professor Schrier felt the question should not focus on rationality as much it should stress "the urge

to innovate." Where there is this urge, you have the dynamics for change. The Chinese had gunpowder and coal but did not have the urge to innovate. This dynamic did come to fruition in the West first. There were some Chinese who had the innovative spirit but they were suppressed by an elite whose thinking patterns were formed by Confucianism. Professor Schrier pointed out that many scholars assert that the lack of an innovative spirit still exists among many Chinese to this day.

Another participant, Professor Ernest Menze of Iona College, found the modernization model good but incomplete, for it fails to give proper credit to intellectual history. Professor Menze noted that probably the first critique of the modernization theory was given in the eighteenth century by Johann Gottfried von Herder. Professor Menze believed it striking how Herder attacked the mechanistic, rationalistic temper of his time. Herder was looking backward in history and can thus be considered a traditionalist, but Professor Menze sees him as a great modernizer. In Professor Menze's view, there is a discernible line of such modernizers in intellectual history who are not really recognized in modernization models.

Feeling from the discussion that there were participants in the audience who had problems with the modernization theory, Professor Thompson asked what the alternatives were. What seemed to be left was a Marxist or a diffusionist model. But Professor Reilly questioned why there must be one model. Why can there not be a number of different models or theories that we use in our teaching? Major Dixon responded that the "biggest presumption we make when we talk about 'world history' is that there is such a thing and that it is one story."

Another participant rejoined that "... one advantage of being a historian was that you didn't have to have a box ... that you started at the beginning and unravelled the story." She felt there were many ways to explain history. "But," another participant humorously reminded her, "only one of them is right!"

NOTE: The session was obviously lively and discussed many of the pros and cons of one popular model for teaching world history. It is interesting to note that the Academy decided to drop the heavy emphasis of the modernization model in the spring semester, 1984, due to many of the problems echoed at the workshop, as well as a lack of appropriate reading materials.

Session 5: "Tools of the Trade: Available Resources"
Presentations: Dr. Marilyn Hitchens
Professor Robert Roeder

In this session, Dr. Hitchens moved the focus of the workshop from the theoretical to the practical. She began the session in an amusing fashion by having participants read sections of an entertaining article entitled "A History of the Past: 'Life Reeked with Joy'," based on freshman university papers submitted to Professor Anders Henriksson (see Appendix F). The exercise proved enjoyable and, as Dr. Hitchens noted, it was her effort to compensate for "... the complete lack of reading at the workshop" especially since much had been said about the reading level and interest of students.

Dr. Hitchens divided the "tools of the trade" into three categories: technical, intellectual, and political. She discussed these categories from her particular position as a secondary school instructor but made some general comments applicable to all world history teachers.

In the technical category, Dr. Hitchens included such things as textbooks, supplementary readings, movies--in other words, what the teachers use, other than themselves, in teaching their course. Generally speaking, Dr. Hitchens felt that there was a good assortment of materials available for secondary school teachers. In many cases, she felt that the problem was more a matter of time to prepare and use what was already available rather than searching for something new. In fact, Dr. Hitchens criticized those who were always looking for the latest and greatest, saying such an attitude "... is symptomatic of a certain self-flagellation on the part of teachers and administrators who see the lack of student interest and motivation as their own fault rather than as a societal statement to the effect that instant self-gratification is assumed and education taken for granted--for by the laws of economics, the more accessible the product, the less value the merchandise."

Dr. Hitchens felt that the existing materials for world history are leaner than for other secondary school history courses. However, even here, the sources are growing. Having taught courses both using a text and ones which use a variety of readings, Dr. Hitchens tended to prefer a textbook and felt that students also liked to have a text. There are a growing number of high school world history texts and Dr. Hitchens provided a list of some quality works (the list appears as Appendix G). She did feel that a good collection of primary documents and a similar collection of films, oriented to world history rather than area histories, are items which would be very valuable for the secondary school instructor.

The second category discussed by Dr. Hitchens was intellectual tools. Under this heading, she referred to "... goals, content, conceptualization, and knowledge--in sum, the total reach of the teacher's education and experience." She saw history as a discipline which was essential to human understanding and meaning.

And "world history" gives the discipline a new perspective. Like past speakers, she agreed that citizenship, both national and international, was a valid reason and goal for world history. Dr. Hitchens suggested others such as the businessman who must develop markets and calculate the security of his investment. She also pointed to the State Department "whose compartmentalization and specialization does not address the real dynamic internationalization in foreign policy development." Dr. Hitchens feels that historians themselves benefit from the experience of teaching a world history course. As she put it, "Our own specialities will certainly be enriched if we can compare and contrast, become aware of outside influences, and see that broad view in terms of human development. In addition, new meaning emerges from old knowledge when looked at in a new way, and new knowledge is gleaned from research with a new orientation."

Alluding to discussion from previous sessions, Dr. Hitchens recognized the disagreement on content in the world history course, even amongst its strongest advocates. She reminded her audience that other groups at other times have faced similar problems. For example, she pointed out that historians in the late nineteenth century were swamped by the monographic output of their colleagues in related fields. Consequently, the historian, like other specialists, was in danger of knowing more and more about less and less. Dr. Hitchens noted that this was the impetus for Lord Acton's call for the Cambridge Modern History. Acton devoted much of his energy in his last years to coordinating the series, considered a monument of objective, detailed, and collaborative scholarship.

Dr. Hitchens was confident that world history advocates could fashion a good product if basic objectives were kept in mind. As she emphasized:

I think it is quite possible to develop a one year world history course for high school and college students, and I would use as my framework the dimensions of history--time and space, the truths of our discipline like continuity and change, diffusion and integration, cause and effect, differences and similarities, logic and irrationality, personalities and institutions, and the focus of history--man and his story. The concepts are more debatable, less enduring and less stable because they are human fabrication emerging from perspective, research, knowledge and individual value orientation. However, I hope that these issues would not mire us in endless dispute when, in fact, there is room for such diversity and creativity in the art of history.



Dr. Marilyn Hitchens gets Session 5 off to a humorous start with a reading of some student work.

For Dr. Hitchens the consensus process on the question of content is important and urgent. While on the one hand, there are many signs that world history is a rising star (including the conclusions of a recent Presidential Commission that the study of foreign languages, cultures, and history is important to our national survival), there has been a tendency to go "... riding off in all directions." Dr. Hitchens pointed to California which is considering curriculum revisions which will strengthen core disciplines, while New York is moving in the opposite direction proposing to submerge history in a broader social science framework. There are also other groups ready to "... wrest the field from us." An example given here was the Center for Teaching International Relations at the University of Denver where "global history" has been developed as a means of teaching world history. Thus, it is imperative that historians take the lead in an area that is rightly their province.

Dr. Hitchens did have some specific ideas on how that leadership role could be asserted. First of all, within the historical profession, world history should be recognized as a valid discipline. World historians should press for a World History Advanced Placement course rather than a European Advanced Placement course in the high schools. Time and money should be allotted to give teachers access to retraining, rethinking, and rewriting curriculum. Finally, those with experience in teaching world history should encourage new brethren to "... take away the fears of teachers about what they do not know and replace them with the true excitement of learning something new and of falling in love again with a culture and people foreign from ourselves."

The third tool which Dr. Hitchens discussed is the political tool. She admitted that this was something that she recognized reluctantly but that it is a reality, perhaps more so at the secondary school level. As she said, "... since educators are, in a sense, economic parasites dependent on financial and public support, we must sell our idea first to our colleagues and then to our funding constituents." And Dr. Hitchens warned that if advocates of world history cannot come to agreement amongst themselves, the public will tell them what to do and will not give them the necessary time and resources. In Dr. Hitchens' view "... we must come up with a good plan and soon to survive."

Professor Roeder's presentation was really a continuation of his previous day's remarks. During this session, he explained the philosophy of his world history course (see Appendix E).

Key to this philosophy was Professor Roeder's belief that a world history course "... ought to be a drama that involves the world ..." and not a tour of one geographical area after another. Seeing world history as a dramatic pattern enables the historian "... to make some sense of the great welter of events" and also permits the historian to make intelligent decisions about what information he is going to talk about. Viewing world history as a scenario also has a pedagogic value; just as a good book or film catches and holds people's interest, a world history course

which gradually unfolds an exciting and important story can help capture the student's interest. Finally, Professor Roeder's personal philosophy is served by such a course. As he explained, "I can't understand history except as a product of human striving, aspirations, struggle, and conflict . . . unless I can see actors attempting to do things and either succeeding or frustrating themselves or meeting tragic ends . . . I just don't understand what's happening in history and am incapable of being able to teach what's happening to other people."

Following these introductory remarks, Professor Roeder explained the elements of his world history course in more detail. The entire course was viewed as a grand play; at times, Professor Roeder would even use the language of the playwright to describe his course. He felt that the first part of the course, entitled "The Old Regimes," which examines the order of society on the eve of modernization, was indispensable in setting the historic stage (see Appendix G for the schematic outline on "Old Regimes"). Professor Roeder particularly stressed that an understanding of the village life in each of the six societies he deemed most important (China, Japan, Mogul Empire, Ottoman Empire, Russia, and northwest Europe) was a basic foundation for the course. The village was central to the old regimes--the area that the elite of the society had to control to be successful. The village was also where 80 to 85% of the people lived. Thus, Professor Roeder feels that it is necessary to connect the main players and contributions of civilizations ". . . with the aspirations, the actions, and the circumstances of ordinary people."

What Professor Roeder refers to as act two of his scenario is entitled "The Crystallization of Modernity." This period runs from about 1775 to 1825. In many ways, he feels that his treatment of this period parallels what has traditionally been done by historians. He stressed the "startling concentration of events taking place" in the West during this time span. Intellectually, politically, and economically, the industrial revolution brought changes to the West which would affect the whole globe. One difference in Professor Roeder's course perhaps is that students have a solid foundation of what came before and a basis of comparison among different societies.

As the title of the third section of the course reveals, "The Struggle between Modernity and the Old Regimes" (c.1800-c.1920), Professor Roeder feels that the key to this period is the story of struggle. It is "conscious, explicit, outright struggle between the forces of modernity . . . and the forces of conservatism . . ." And it can be seen in many ways. "Why are all these heroes of liberalism incessantly getting slaughtered by evil secret policemen in all of those Verdi operas?", Professor Roeder asked. For him, the answer lies in the tension between modernity and conservatism. This tension begins in the West and then spreads across the world. The story is clear for Professor Roeder up until World War I. Conservative forces, "the bad guys," win most of the time during this period.

The final two sections of the course, "The Collapse of the Old Regimes" (c.1910-c.1930), and "The Era of Competing Modernizing Elites" (c.1920-Present) tell the story of "all those old orders of the old regime" finally collapsing. It is also the period of struggle between proponents of different formulas for modernization. Professor Roeder concluded his remarks on the course by noting that he is writing a text to follow his world history scenario.

In his final comments, Professor Roeder had two practical teaching hints for the workshop participants. First, he suggested taping a classroom presentation. In most cases, he feels that listening to the tape will provide a humbling experience. However, he has found that the practice is an invaluable aid to assist in honing teaching skills. Professor Roeder also has had success in organizing class periods around a series of questions. His world history course uses this method. The questions serve as a basis of discussion and give focus to reading assignments.

DISCUSSION

The discussion period following this session was brief due to the length of the presentations. The discussion centered on available texts and supplementary readings for a world history course. One participant noted that there does seem to be more available for the secondary school teacher than the college instructor. In fact, three or four participants were working on texts for a college world history course. (NOTE: While this is noteworthy, it is perhaps also an indicator of the lack of organization in the field of world history. Historians are writing texts to fit "their" course, and the leadership and unity viewed as vital by some participants was not indicated by the goal of such projects).

Dr. Hitchens had spoken of the need for a world history reader for the secondary schools and a similar need was seen on the collegiate level. A few participants had done work in this area and it was felt that the World History Association would be performing an important service if it could make its members aware of what had been done. It was also noted that many of the documents prior to the twentieth century were in the public domain and could now be reproduced with minimal cost.

SESSION 6: "The Ultimate Challenge: Teaching World History"
Presentation: Professor John M. Thompson

Opening the session, Professor Thompson announced to the workshop participants that it was finally time for them to work. He concentrated his time on two important areas: selection of the best topics for a world history course and transfer of the material from instructor to student.

To deal with the first area, Professor Thompson divided his audience into groups of five or six people each. Each group was to select ten topics for a course or part of a course dealing with twentieth century world history. Each topic would have about three lessons devoted to it for a total of thirty lessons. These ten topics, then, were to be the most important items for the student to learn. Professor Thompson gave the groups about eleven minutes to come up with their lists! Some of the topics selected by the groups were:

- Mass Society and Mobilization
- Imperialism and World War I
- Scientific/Technical Revolution
- Revolutions (political)
- Technology in a Nuclear Age
- Social and Cultural Change in the 20th Century
- Nationalism vs Globalism
- Persistence of Traditional Values in the 20th Century
- Cultural Disorientation: Changes in Values
- Racism
- Economic Interdependence
- Energy

After the topics were listed, Professor Thompson noted the lack of emphasis on political history, a staple in teaching history in years past. He questioned the topic of revolution feeling that the chance of political revolutions in an industrial society was minimal. Professor Thompson also had serious reservations about energy as a topic. While distribution could be a problem, the energy scare that existed a few years ago has dissipated. It was becoming apparent, as one participant noted, that Professor Thompson was not enthralled with the groups' selections.

Professor Thompson then listed the "top ten" topics that he would choose:

- Anti-Imperialism/Nationalism
- Ethnic Conflict
- Militarism/Arms Race
- Authoritarianism
- Economic Development
- World War I
- USSR
- USA as a World Power
- Population Growth
- Women's Rights



Professor Jack Thompson, a former Distinguished Visting Professor at the Academy, encourages workshop participants to make world history an exciting experience for students.

Obviously, there was some overlap in the two lists, but Professor Thompson emphasized the differences. Militarism, for example, is very significant. He feels that there is a willingness to resort to arms in this century that did not exist in earlier periods. A separate treatment of the Soviet Union and the United States was considered essential for students. And while the energy question may have lost some of its validity, Professor Thompson felt that the population question continued to be crucial.

Professor Thompson then discussed the transfer of information in the classroom. What does it take to get students' interest and then retention of the information discussed? First of all, he emphasized that world history cannot be taught as a series of abstract, unrelated facts. World history must deal with real people who come alive for the students. Professor Thompson recalled past workshop sessions when Academy instructors noted they often were able to use their overseas experience in the classroom. He also strongly advocated "active learning," whereby students take part in the classroom activity. Active learning can take place through open discussion, dividing the classroom into groups to discuss issues and draw conclusions, and various types of role-playing situations. He was aware of criticisms of such methods--that they tend to produce half-baked ideas with little real learning accomplished. He stressed, however, that these methods need a great deal of preparation and that the instructor needed to follow up the activity with time for a "lessons learned" session with the students. Active learning is better, according to Professor Thompson, not only because it maintains both student and instructor interest, but because studies have shown that students retain more when they are participants in the learning process.

As the session and the workshop came to a close, Professor Thompson urged the participants to realize that they have embarked on a new frontier of history. There are problems of organization, of content, and of style but the participants were breaking new ground. Americans can be justly proud that they are leaders in this effort. Finally, Professor Thompson noted that it is rather ironic that, aside from the United States, the only other country stressing world history is the Soviet Union--a country which has no problems coming up with the "right interpretation" of world history.

APPENDIX A

ACADEMIC SURVEY, USAFA CLASS OF 1987

NOTE: In the summer of 1983, the Academy surveyed the incoming class of fourth class (freshmen) cadets to determine the extent of their previous exposure to history. Captain Mark Wells was project officer for the survey. It confirmed that while American History is still an important part of most students' high school curriculum, a World or European History course is likely to be taken by about fifty percent of the students.

High School History, Class of 1987

GRADE	U.S. HISTORY	WORLD HISTORY	EUROPEAN	OTHER (STATE)
9	11.4%	11.4%	1.4%	3.3%
10	24.0%	21.7%	4.0%	.8%
11	67.5%	5.2%	1.2%	.4%
12	6.3%	2.0%	1.4%	.4%
TOTALS	102.9%*	40.3%	8.0%	4.9%

*Reflects small percentage of cadets who had more than one U.S. History course.

APPENDIX B

NOTE: The following is an abbreviated version of the Academy's History 101 Honors course syllabus from the fall of 1980. Included are the course calendar, course philosophy, course theme, and course materials.

HISTORY 101 HONORS, FALL 1980 U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

PART ONE: SURVEY OF THE PRE-MODERN WORLD

LESSON

Section I: Preliminaries

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 8-11 Aug | 1. Introduction and Administration |
| 12-13 Aug | 2. Geography and Culture |
| 14-15 Aug | 3. Civilization and Barbarians in Eurasia |

Section II: Major Traditional Cultures

- | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| 18-19 Aug | 4. Hindu South Asia |
| 20-21 Aug | 5. Chinese Civilization |
| 22-25 Aug | 6. Buddhist Asia |
| 26-27 Aug | 7. The Christian World |
| 28-29 Aug | 8. The Triumph of Islam |
| 2- 3 Sep | 9. Worlds Apart: Africa and America |

PART TWO: MODERNIZATION IN THE WEST

Section I: Transition to Modern Culture

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 4- 5 Sep | 10. The Triumph of Secularism:
The Renaissance |
| 8- 9 Sep | 11. Reaction to Secularism:
The Reformation |

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 10-11 Sep | 12. The Commerical
Explosion: Modern
Capitalism is Born |
| 12-15 Sep | 13. Absolutism Triumphant:
The Modern State Takes
Form |
| 16-17 Sep | 14. The Age of Reason |
| 18-19 Sep | 15. GRADED REVIEW #1 |

Section II: The Flowering of Modernization

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 22-23 Sep | 16. Political Revolution
in the West |
| 24-25 Sep | 17. The Machine Age is Born |
| 26-29 Sep | 18. Modern Ideologies |
| 30 Sep-1 Oct | 19. The Politics of
Nationalism |

PART III: THE DIFFUSION OF MODERNIZATION

Section I: Emigration and Imperialism

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 2- 3 Oct | 20. Europeans in New Lands |
| 6- 7 Oct | 21. The Basis of
Imperialism |
| 9-10 Oct | 22. Imperialism I: Africa
and the Middle East |
| 14-15 Oct | 23. Imperialism II: The
Asian Response |
| 16-17 Oct | 24. The Nature of
Imperialism |

Section II: The Spread of Modernization

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 20-21 Oct | 25. The Great War of 1914 |
| 22-23 Oct | 26. The Creation of Soviet
Russia |
| 24-27 Oct | 27. Democracy and
Disillusion in
the 1920s |
| 28-29 Oct | 28. Response and Revolt |

30-31 Oct

3- 4 Nov

Section III: Post-War Themes

5- 6 Nov

10-11 Nov

12-13 Nov

14-17 Nov

Section IV: Problems of Modernization

18-19 Nov

20-21 Nov

24-25 Nov

26-28 Nov

1- 2 Dec

3- 4 Dec

5- 6 Dec

29. Depression and War

30. GRADED REVIEW #2

31. The West and the Cold War

32. Three Paths to Modernization

33. From Empire to Nation: The Third World

34. Adjustment to Modernization

35. Modernization and Conflict

36. Population and Food

37. Technology and Ecology

38. Violence and Political Change

39. Instructor's Choice

40. Review and Critique

41-42. Oral Exams; No Class

I. COURSE PHILOSOPHY

Man has lived on the earth for a long time. There are many reasons for studying what our ancestors, however distant and remote, have done. There are also many ways of studying the past. Many of your high school friends going to other colleges may study the History of Western Civilization, or perhaps the History of Europe. Some of them may study World History, as you will do at the Air Force Academy. The primary reason the Academy offers a course in World History is obvious: this institution has as its mission the training and education of future military officers who will live and work in a global environment. We cannot afford to study only our own heritage.

That a history course takes as its objective understanding the present world deserves perhaps a comment or two. "I protest," many would say, "for the domain of history is the past--not the present." This course has been created upon the presumption that study of the past provides an explanation of the present world. That's part of the reason this course is included in a core curriculum required of every cadet.

II. COURSE THEME

Anything so diverse and complicated as the history of mankind needs an organizational principle or theme to reduce it to manageable proportions. The major theme or thread which ties this course together is the concept of modernization.

In the section above on course philosophy, the purpose of the course was defined as providing "...intellectual tools and essential information necessary for students to develop a coherent, meaningful view of the world, based upon analysis and interpretation of human history." The most important tool offered is the concept of modernization. Because of its importance for this course, we must make some attempts at defining it.

On one level, defining modernization is simple; it is the process of becoming modern. That leaves us with another problem, of course: the definition of "modern." The dictionary description of the word "modern" as an adjective equates it to "recent" or "contemporary." It is true that our use of the word modern implies developments which have taken place since "ancient" or "medieval" times, but the word modern means more than that. Time alone cannot be the criterion, for we can identify "traditional" or "pre-modern" societies which exist in the twentieth century.

As a starting point, one can contrast modern societies with traditional ones. But we must recognize that while traditional cultures share the characteristic of being non-modern, they may share little else. Each in some ways is particular and unique. In the first part of this course, we will look at the chief examples of traditional cultures: Hindu South Asia, Confucian China, Buddhist Asia, Western Civilization and Christianity before the Renaissance, the Islamic civilization of the Middle East, Africa

south of the Sahara, and the American Indian civilizations before the arrival of Columbus. The second part of the course centers on the process of modernization as it evolved in the West (Europe and lands settled by Europeans). The third and final part of the course focuses on the diffusion of modernization from its western cradle to the far corners of the earth. The interaction of traditional cultures and modernizing influences provides the milieu within which a number of contemporary problems will be analyzed.

Modern societies seem to differ from traditional cultures regarding fragmentation of human life. Most notably, in modern civilization there is a separation of religious thought and attitudes from the secular concerns of what modern man calls "everyday life." But there is also a division of secular affairs into separate spheres: political, social, economic, intellectual, psychological, public, private, community, family and individual. As modern men and women, we find it uncomfortable and even embarrassing to ask, "What does it mean to be human?" At best, we study man as a political animal, or a social creature, or a rational being. Specialized studies invent such monstrosities as "economic man." Modern human existence has become so complex we look only at a small slice of it at one time. A proliferation of separate disciplines to study these aspects of man has given us a whole new category of intellectual activity. The "social sciences" are characteristically modern: sociology, anthropology, psychology, political science, economics, management, even "urban studies," and all the rest.

Another important dimension to modern life is change. We have all grown up hearing the cliché that the only constant thing in life is change. That cliché is peculiarly modern; traditional wisdom would be much less likely to agree.

Modern civilization is particularly proud of its mastery over the physical environment. Cadets at the Air Force Academy have a special relationship to one of man's most awesome and promising conquests of the physical environment: flight and the exploration of space. The ravages of technology on nature which have accompanied man's achievements have not gone unnoticed, however; the ecology movement of the 1960s and the 1970s reminds us that "modern" does not necessarily mean "good" or "better."

Politically, modernization has incorporated the idea that man has control over his own political and social environment. Society and government are seen by modern man as human constructs which should conform to rational criteria. Authority is accepted only if it has some rational justification. Rulers are no longer considered legitimate just because of heredity, or race, or prowess in battle.

Economically, the modern world is marked by the use of machinery to produce goods and services for human use and consumption. The technological innovations of the "industrial revolution" are the most conspicuous indicators of modernization.

As we continue to add to our list of modern characteristics, it is easy to suspect the term "modern" is so broad and all-inclusive that it really means nothing at all. Indeed, some scholars have argued persuasively that a precise "scientific" definition of modernization is impossible. However, it seems clear that the term still has great usefulness in helping us understand the world. Rather than struggling to develop a "scientific" definition of the term, we will simply regard it as a label applied to the whole complex of developments in Europe which occurred since the Renaissance. Our definition of the term will evolve as we study part two of this course, "Modernization in the West."

III. COURSE MATERIALS

a. "Syllabus and Study Guide for History 101 Honors"--which you are reading at this moment.

b. "Readings for History 101 Honors"--to be handed out in class.

c. The basic text for the course is Civilization Past and Present by T. Walter Wallbank, et al.

d. A Study Guide to accompany the text is entitled Studying Civilization: A Guide to World History and Its Implications.

e. A collection of documents edited by Harry J. Carroll, Jr., et al., will serve to introduce primary sources and a variety of historical interpretations: The Development of Civilization: A Documentary History of Politics, Society, and Thought.

f. Random House Historical Issues Series, volume 19, provides special readings on imperialism: The Origins of Modern Imperialism--Ideological or Economic?

g. The major source for geographical information will be the Goode's World Atlas, which all cadets will be issued as incoming Fourth Classmen.

h. Historical geography comes from the USAFA Hammond Historical Atlas, which all cadets should receive as incoming Fourth Classmen.

i. USAFA Library holdings constitute an important part of the materials you will use for this course.

APPENDIX C

NOTE: The following is an abbreviated version of the Academy's History 101 course syllabus from the fall of 1982. Included are the course calendar, course description, and course materials.

HISTORY 101, FALL 1982 U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

I. COURSE CALENDAR

<u>DATE</u>	<u>LESSON</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>ASSIGNMENT</u>
INTRODUCTION			
12-13 Aug	1	Course Introduction and Administration	None.
16-17 Aug	2	Modernization and World History* (Lectinar)	Reading #1, pp. 1-6.

* A "lectinar" is a special lecture, delivered by a history department member with expertise on the topic, to several classes in a horseshoe-shaped room (approximate capacity: 75 persons) called a lectinar room.

--- BLOCK I: TRANSFORMATION OF THE WEST--THE FIRST MODERN CULTURE ---

18-19 Aug	3	Medieval Europe	Reading #2, pp. 7-16.
20-23 Aug	4	Commercial Revolution	Reading #3, pp. 17-32.
24-25 Aug	5	Intellectual Revolution (Lectinar)	Reading #4, pp. 41-52.
26-27 Aug	6	Political Revolution	Reading #5, pp. 41-52; #6, pp. 53-55; #7, pp. 57-68.

30-31 Aug	7	Industrial Revolution	Reading #8, pp. 69-82.
1- 2 Sep	8	Modern Ideologies I: Liberalism and Socialism	Reading #9, pp. 83-88; Reading #10, pp. 89-94. Howarth, pp. 15-17.
3- 7 Sep	9	Modern Ideologies II: Nationalism and Imperialism	Reading #11, pp. 95-98. Howarth, pp. 1-14.
8- 9 Sep	10	Modern Europe's First Great Crisis: The First World War	Howarth, pp. 18-33; 39-43.
10-13 Sep	11	Return to Normalcy	Howarth, pp. 44-61; 84-89.
14-15 Sep	12	Crisis in Economic Development	Howarth, pp. 90-108; 114-116; 128-129; 132-140.
16-17 Sep	13	Prelude to War	Howarth, pp. 108-111; 117-128; 160-172.
20-21 Sep	14	GRADED REVIEW	Review.

BLOCK II: DIFFUSION OF MODERNITY

22-23 Sep	15	Modernization Beyond the West: Setting the Stage	Reading #12, pp. 99-108.
24-27 Sep	16	Traditional Russia (Lectinar)	Reading #13, pp. 109-117.
28-29 Sep	17	Early Russian Modernization and and the Russian Revolution	Reading #14, pp. 119-128. Howarth, pp. 33-38.

30 Sep-1 Oct	18	Modernization in the Soviet Union	Howarth, pp. 61-63; 140-151.
4- 5 Oct	19	Traditional World of Islam (Lectinar)	Reading #15, pp. 129-140.
6- 7 Oct	20	Beginnings of Modernization in the Middle East	Reading #16, pp. 141-152.
8-11 Oct	21	Acceleration of Modernization in the Middle East	Reading #17, pp. 153-168.
13-14 Oct	22	Traditional Africa and the Impact of the West	Reading #18, pp. 169-182. Howarth, pp. 72-74.
15-18 Oct	23	Traditional South Asia (Lectinar)	Reading #19, pp. 183-194.
19-20 Oct	24	British India	Handout (TBA) Howarth, pp. 75-77.
21-22 Oct	25	Traditional East Asia (Lectinar)	Yang & Lazzerini, Introduction, pp. 1-8; 15-16; 22-24; 27-28. Miller, pp. 9-10; 13-16; 17-21.
25-26 Oct	26	China and the Beginnings of Modernization	Yang & Lazzerini, pp. 29-43. Howarth, pp. 77-79.
27-28 Oct	27	Modernization in Japan	Miller, pp. 27-57;
29 Oct-1 Nov	28	Latin America	Reading #20, pp. 195-203. Howarth, pp. 79-82; 112
2-3 Nov	29	GRADED REVIEW	Review.

BLOCK III: THE CONTEMPORARY INTERDEPENDENT WORLD

4- 8 Nov	30	The Second World War (Lectinar)	Howarth, pp. 197-224.
9-10 Nov	31	Great Powers and Blocs	Howarth, pp. 224-254.
11-12 Nov	32	Europe: Integration or Division	Howarth, pp. 263-278. World Politics, pp. 158-159.
15-16 Nov	33	Japan: The Economic Miracle	Miller, pp. 60-70.
17-18 Nov	34	Modernization in Communist China	Yang & Lazzerini, pp. 67-82. World Politics, pp. 225-229.
19-22 Nov	35	The Third World: Background	Howarth, pp. 279-285; 288-291; 297-300. World Politics, pp. 98-99.
23-24 Nov	36	The Third World: Problems of Modernization	World Politics, pp. 100-108; 119; 121-123.
29-30 Nov	37	Interdependence: Latin America	World Politics, pp. 188-201.
1- 2 Dec	38	Interdependence: Southern Africa	Howarth, pp. 285-288. World Politics, pp. 203-213; 221-224.
3- 4 Dec	39	Interdependence: The Middle East	Howarth, pp. 291-297. World Politics, pp. 124-139.
6- 7 Dec	40	Problems of Modernity: The Arms Race	World Politics, pp. 48-54; 64-70.

8- 9 Dec	41	Modernity and the Future	World Politics, pp. 230-231; 239-241; 259-261; 263-264.
10-13 Dec	42	Summary and Critique	Review
15-21 Dec		FINAL EXAMS	

II. COURSE DESCRIPTION

A. The purpose of this course is to give cadets a global perspective of modern world history. The primary reason the Academy offers a course in world history is obvious: this institution has as its mission the training and education of future Air Force officers who will live and work in a modern, global environment. We cannot afford to view the world from an ethnocentric perspective which attaches importance only to our own Western heritage. But anything so diverse and complicated as modern world history needs an organizing principle or theme to reduce it to manageable proportions. The major theme or thread which ties this course together is the concept of modernization.

B. The course begins with a definition of the theme of modernization. Block I deals with the modernization of the West (primarily Europe and the United States). Beginning with the pre-modern (traditional) culture of medieval Europe, succeeding lessons trace the long and difficult transformation of the West into the first modern culture. In Block II we study the spread and impact of modernization in the traditional, non-European cultures of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Finally, Block III looks at the contemporary world to discern the changes and problems caused by the continuing revolution of modernization throughout the world.

III. COURSE MATERIALS

A. Syllabus.

B. Textbooks.

1. Tony Howarth, Twentieth Century History: The World Since 1900 (Harlow, Essex: Longman House, 1979).
2. Richard Yang and Edward J. Lazzerini, The Chinese World (St. Louis: Forum Press, 1978).
3. William J. Miller, The Japanese World (St. Louis: Forum Press, 1977).

4. Chou T. Phan, Ed., World Politics 82/83 (Guilford, Connecticut: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc., 1982).
- C. History 101 "READINGS," Parts I and II (USAFA, Department of History, Fall 1982).
- D. Atlases.
 1. Goode's World Atlas (15th ed.).
 2. USAFA Hammond Historical Atlas.
- E. Lesson Study Guides to be handed out in class.

* * *

HISTORY 101, FALL 1982

READINGS

<u>READING #</u>	<u>TITLE</u>
1	Modernization in World History (Pittman)
2	Europe Before the Renaissance: The Middle Ages (Spires)
3	Early Modern Economics (Clough, <u>et al.</u>)
4	Intellectual Revolution in the West: The Break from Medieval Unity (Dixon)
5	American Revolution (Clough, <u>et al.</u>)
6	Background of the French Revolution (Clough, <u>et al.</u>)
7	The Lower and Middle Classes in the French Revolution (Converse)
8	Industrialization, Social Change and Social Protest (Clough, <u>et al.</u>)
9	Nineteenth Century Liberalism (Albert)
10	The Emergence of Social Protest (Clough, <u>et al.</u>)
54	

- 11 Nineteenth Century Nationalism and Imperialism
 (Brynn)
- 12 The Stage of World History (Dixon)
- 13 Traditional Russia (Thompson)
- 14 Characteristics of Russian Modernization
 (Thompson)
- 15 The World of Islam (Dixon)
- 16 Westernizing Reform in the Nineteenth Century
 (Goldschmidt)
- 17 Modernizing Rulers in the Independent States
 (Goldschmidt)
- 18 The Simpler Societies: Africa and the Americas
 (Meskill, et al.)
- 19 Worlds Apart: South Asia and its Neighbors (Dixon)
- 20 Latin America: The Problems of Modernization
 (Pittman)

APPENDIX D

NOTE: The following is an abbreviated version of the Academy's History 101 Course syllabus from the fall of 1983. Included are the course calendar, course description, and course materials.

HISTORY 101, FALL 1983 U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

I. COURSE CALENDAR

<u>DATE</u>	<u>LESSON</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>ASSIGNMENT</u>
BLOCK I: GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY			
15-16 Aug	1	Introduction	Goff, pp. 408-419.
17-18 Aug	2	The Study of World History (Lectinar)	Reading #1, pp. 1-10. Reading #2, pp. 11-16.
BLOCK II: MODERNIZATION OF EUROPE			
19-22 Aug	3	Birth of European Civilization	Reading #3, pp. 17-30.
23-24 Aug	4	Transformation of European Civilization	Reading #4, pp. 31-36. Columbia, pp. 619-625. Reading #5, pp. 37-42.
25-26 Aug	5	Consolidation of Power and Knowledge	Reading #6, pp. 43-50. Reading #7, pp. 51-56.
27-29 Aug	6	Political Revolution (Lectinar)	Reading #21.

30-31 Aug	7	Industrial Revolution	Reading #8, pp. 57-70.
1-2 Sep	8	Ideologies: Liberalism and Socialism	Reading #9, pp. 71-76. Reading #10, pp. 77-82. Goff, 19-22.
6-7 Sep	9	Ideologies: Nationalism and Imperialism	Reading #11, pp. 83-86. Goff, pp. 9-19.
8-9 Sep	10	GRADED REVIEW #1	Review.

BLOCK III: MODERNIZATION BEYOND EUROPE

12-13 Sep	11	Birth of the United States	Columbia, pp. 753-763; 790-799.
14-15 Sep	12	The Early Modern U.S.A.	Columbia, pp. 894-904; 839-847. Goff, pp. 51-55. <u>NOTE: WRITTEN PROJECT #1 DUE.</u>
16-19 Sep	13	Latin America	Columbia, pp. 649-651. Reading #12, pp. 87-95. Goff, pp. 55-60.
20-21 Sep	14	Traditional Russia (Lectinar)	Reading #13, pp. 97-105.
22-23 Sep	15	Early Modernization in Russia	Reading #14, pp. 107-116. Goff, pp. 33-35.
26-27 Sep	16	The Great War	Goff, pp. 92-110.
28-29 Sep	17	Aftermath of the Great War	Goff, pp. 116-124; 130-138; 185 (middle)-188; 190-192.

30 Sep-3 Oct	18	Revolution and Creation of the Soviet Union	Goff, pp. 140-149. Columbia, pp. 997- "The contingency"- 1902. "totalitarian."
--------------	----	---	--

4- 5 Oct	19	GRADED REVIEW #2	Review.
----------	----	------------------	---------

BLOCK IV: MODERNIZATION BEYOND THE WEST

6-10 Oct	20	Traditional Islamic Civilization (Lectinar)	Reading #15, pp. 117-124. Columbia, pp. 610, 614.
11-12 Oct	21	Modernization in the Middle East	Columbia, pp. 813-821. Goff, pp. 78-81; 174-175.
14-17 Oct	22	Traditional Africa (Lectinar)	Reading #19.
18-19 Oct	23	Early Modernization in Africa	Reading #20.
20-21 Oct	24	Traditional South Asian Civilization	Reading #16, pp. 125-136.
24-25 Oct	25	Modernization in British India	Reading #17, pp. 137-148. Goff, pp. 164-169.
26-27 Oct	26	Traditional Chinese Civilization (Lectinar)	Columbia, See Study Guide.
28-31 Oct	27	Traditional Japanese Civilization	Reading #18, pp. 149-154. Columbia, pp. 635-641.
1- 2 Nov	28	Modernization in China	Goff, pp. 76-78; 151-157. Columbia, pp. 938-944; 1022-1028.

3- 4 Nov	29	Modernization Japan	Goff, pp. 63-67; 86-90; 194-195. Columbia, pp. 1028-1035.
7- 8 Nov	30	GRADED REVIEW #3	Review.>

BLOCK V: MODERNITY AND GLOBAL INTERDEPENDENCE

9-10 Nov	31	The Great Depression	Goff, 197-202; 192-193 (top); 204-218.
11-14 Nov	32	The Road to War	Goff, pp. 219-230.
15-16 Nov	33	World War II	Goff, pp. 231-247. NOTE: WRITTEN PROJECT #2 DUE.
17-18 Nov	34	Origins of the Cold War	Goff, pp. 273-294.
21-22 Nov	35	Asia: Decolonization and Cold War	Goff, pp. 296-306; 314-328.
23-28 Nov	36	The U.S. and War in Indochina (Lectinar)	Goff, pp. 329-341.
29-30 Nov	37	Modernization in Africa	Goff, pp. 343-356.
1-2 Dec	38	Crisis in the Middle East	Goff, pp. 171-174; 306-312; 358-367.
5-6 Dec	39	The New Europe and Detente	Goff, pp. 369-381.
7-8 Dec	40	Turmoil in Latin America	Goff, pp. 382-397.
9-12 Dec	41	The Postwar World and Beyond	Goff, pp. 256-272; 399-406.
13-14 Dec	42	Review and Critique	
16-21 Dec		FINAL EXAMS	

II. COURSE DESCRIPTION

A. The purpose of this course is to give cadets a global perspective of modern world history. The primary reason the Academy offers a course in world history is obvious: this institution has as its mission the training and education of future Air Force officers who will live and work in a modern, global environment. We cannot afford to view the world from an ethnocentric perspective which attaches importance only to our own Western heritage. But anything so diverse and complicated as modern world history needs an organizing principle or theme to reduce it to manageable proportions. The major theme or thread which ties this course together is the concept of modernization.

B. The course begins with a definition of the theme of modernization in Block I. Blocks II and III deal with the modernization of the West (primarily Europe and the United States). Beginning with the pre-modern (traditional) culture of medieval Europe, succeeding lessons trace the long and difficult transformation of the West into the first modern culture. In Block IV we study the spread and impact of modernization in the traditional, non-Western cultures of Asia and Africa. Finally, Block V looks at the contemporary world to discern the changes and problems caused by the continuing revolution of modernization throughout the world.

III. COURSE MATERIALS

A. Syllabus.

B. Textbooks.

1. Richard Goff, Walter Moss, Janice Terry, Jim-Hwa Upshur, The Twentieth Century, A Brief Global History (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1983).

2. John A. Garraty and Peter Gay, The Columbia History of the World (New York: Harper and Row, 1972).

3. John G. Albert and David A. Robertson, eds., Readings in Modern World History (USAFA, Department of History, Fall 1983).

C. Atlases.

1. Goode's World Atlas (16th ed.).

2. USAFA Hammond Historical Atlas.

D. Lesson Study Guides.

HISTORY 101, FALL 1983

READINGS

<u>READING #</u>	<u>TITLE</u>
1	The Stage of World History (Dixon)
2	Modernization in World History (Pittman, Dixon)
3	The Birth of European Civilization (Dixon)
4	Transformation of European Civilization (Dixon)
5	Economic Revolution (Clough <u>et al.</u>)
6	Consolidation of Power and Knowledge (Dixon)
7	Mercantilism (Clough, <u>et al.</u>)
8	Industrialization, Social Change and Social Protest (Clough, <u>et al.</u>)
9	Nineteenth Century Liberalism (Albert)
10	The Emergence of Social Protest (Clough, <u>et al.</u>)
11	Nineteenth Century Nationalism and Imperialism (Brynn)
12	Latin America: The Problems of Modernization (Pittman)
13	Traditional Russia (Thompson)
14	Characteristics of Russian Modernization (Thompson)
15	The World of Islam (Dixon)
16	Worlds Apart: South Asia and Its Neighbors (Dixon)
17	British India (Albert)
18	Pre-Modern Japan (Caine)
19	The "Dark" Continent (Albert)
20	Africa and the West (Albert)
21	The French Revolution and Development of Modern Politics (Albert)

APPENDIX E

NOTE: The following is an abbreviated version of Professor Robert Roeder's World History course syllabus from the summer of 1983. Included are the scope of the course, materials required, and the course calendar.

Summer, 1983
Historical Introduction to the Modern World
University of Denver
General Information

Scope: The course will examine historical explanations of how, why and in what varieties an epochal new form of human society has appeared during the past two centuries. In this study of "modernization," attention will be directed to the evolution of modernity in Western European states, and to its diffusion to, and sometimes strange careers in, Russia, China, Japan, India, and the Ottoman Empire.

Books: Each student should have a copy of:

- F. Roy Willis, World Civilizations Volume II (From the Sixteenth Century to the Contemporary Age)
Michael Gasster, China's Struggle to Modernize
Michael Howard, War in European History

Summer, 1983

CALENDAR

(The assigned reading should be completed by the day indicated)

Tues., June 14 1. Introduction: a. Concepts b. Overviews

Part One: The Old Regimes

Wed., June 15 2. East Asian Old Regimes

a. China

Reading: Willis, 731, 753-65; Gasster, Pref., Intro., 3-18

Question: From what bases did the power of the 'gentry' elite of traditional China arise?

b. Japan

Reading: Willis, 765-777

Question: Through what policies did Hideyoshi and his Tokugawa successors bring Japan's chronic civil wars to an end and convert it to a pacific 'centralized feudalism'?

Thurs., June 16

3. Islamic Old Regimes

a. Mogul India

Reading: Willis, 739-753

Question: Why did the great Mogul Empire collapse in the early 18th century?

b. the Ottoman Empire

Reading: Willis, 732-739, 777-784

Question: What were the defining characteristics and social roles of the ulema? of the Janissaries?

Mon., June 20

4. European Old Regimes I

a. Russia and Servile Europe

Reading: Willis, 837-843

Question: What were the defining characteristics of serfdom and why was it preserved (indeed strengthened) in 16th-18th century Russia?

b. the Dutch Republic

Reading: Willis, 785-821

Question: Upon what was the 17th century economic ascendancy of Amsterdam and its mercantile oligarchy based?

Tues., June 21

5. European Old Regimes II

a. France

Reading: Willis, 843-854, 832-837, 897-913

Question: What were the principal elites of the Old Regime in France? What were their relations with one another and with the crown?

b. England

Reading: Willis, 854-867

Question: Who were the oligarchs of oligarchic England and why may they be considered a single elite?

(NOTE: Mid-Term Essay Question will be designated)

Part Two: The Invention of Modernity

Wed., June 22

6. The Triple Revolution

a. Overview

- b. Science and the Enlightenment
 - Reading: Willis, 869-897
 - Question: What was revolutionary in the political and social ideology of the Enlightenment? Why may it be considered an ambiguous ideology?

(NOTE: Mid-Term Essay due)

Thurs., June 23

7. The Emergence of the Egalitarian Nation State

- a. The American Case
 - Reading: Willis, 915-927
 - Question: What were the key problems of political order addressed by American constitution-makers? In what ways were their solutions novel?

- b. The French Case
 - Reading: Willis, 927-947
 - Question: Did Napoleon betray or fulfill the diverse aspirations which produced egalitarian revolution in France?

Mon., June 27

8. The Industrial Revolution

- a. The Transformation of Production and Distribution
 - Reading: Willis, 1013-1037

Question: What essential features of the industrial system of production and distribution were manifest in the early 19th century history of Manchester?

- b. The Transformation of Urban Life
 - Reading: Willis, 1037-1076
 - Question: In what essential ways were the life patterns of the major urban classes changed by the coming into being of the industrial system?

Part Three: Modernity vs. The Old Orders, c.1800-1918

Tues., June 28

9. The Contest in Europe

- a. Metternichian Containment
 - Reading: Willis, 948-1011
 - Question: To what extent and how did old elites of European areas east of France maintain their hold on social and political power during the first half of the 19th century?

b. The Slow Transformation of War

Reading: Howard, 1-93

Question: Why did not the innovations in military organization, tactics and strategy produced by the French Revolution immediately destroy the capacity of the old regimes of the continent to survive?

Wed., June 29

10. 19th Century Imperialism

a. The New Imperialism

Reading: Willis, 1076-1131, 1149-1155

Question: Why, after several centuries of contenting itself with establishing trading relationships, did Europe seek and acquire direct imperial control of so much of Asia and Africa during the last decades of the 19th century?

b. The Survival of Independent Old Orders in the Ottoman Empire and China

Reading: Willis, 1131-1145; Gasster, 19-31

Question: How did the Chinese ruling elite react to the mid-and late 19th century threat of outside dominance?

Thurs., June 30

11. Latecomers to Modernity

a. Japanese and Russian Modernization Compared

Reading: Willis, 1145-1149; 1265-1270

Question: What were the principal similarities in the way Russia and Japan belatedly began to modernize in the half century from the 1860's to World War I? The principal dissimilarities?

b. The Problem of Germany

Reading: Willis, 1157-1179; 1205-1238

Question: Did Germany's somewhat belated achievement of nation-statehood and industrialization leave it with a more volatile and fragile social and political order than those of France and England?

Tues., July 5

12. Europe's Catastrophe

a. Military Evolution and the Coming of the Great War

Reading: Willis, 1239-1250; Howard, 94-115

Question: How did late-19th, early 20th century developments in military organization, equipment, and thinking complicate the tasks of diplomacy and contribute to the outbreak of World War I?

- b. The Political Effects of the Great War
 Reading: Willis, 1250-1257, 1270-1272; Gasster, 31-38
 Question: In which societies and to what extent did the Great War destroy the political power of previously dominant and conservatively-inclined elites?

Part Four: Twentieth Century Turmoils

Wed., July 6 13. The Failed Restoration

- a. Overviews
- b. The "Versailles" System and its Breakdown
 Reading: Willis, 1303-1347; Howard, 116-135
 Question: Why did 'liberal' statesmen's attempts to restore national and international order and progress fail in the 1920's and 1930's?

Thurs., July 7 14. The End of Empire and the Beginning of Asia and Africa

- a. Disintegration of European Empires
 Reading: Willis, 1385-1386; 1409-1447
 Question: What aspirations have driven the quest for independent nationhood in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa since World War I?
- b. Strategies of Modernization
 Reading: Same
 Question: What alternative strategies of modernization have appeared desirable to the leading elites of the new nations?

Mon., July 11 15. Revolutions of the Left

- a. Russia
 Reading: Willis, 1261-1301
 Question: What were the principal elements of Stalin's strategy of modernization? Could he rightfully claim to be Lenin's heir in pursuing this strategy?
- b. China
 Readings: Willis, 1386-1401; Gasster, 38-146
 Question: How did Mao's modernization goals and strategy differ from those of his Russian Communist predecessors?

Tues., July 12

16. High Modernity

- a. Variant Forms of Social and Economic Order in the post-1945 Developed World
Reading: Willis, 1449-1485; 1401-1409
Question: Despite ideological and cultural differences, are there important common features in the economic and social policies of the developed nations of the post-1945 era?
- b. The Urban Order in the Developed World
Reading: Willis, 1349-1383
Question: Is it possible to create satisfactory communities in megalopolis?

(NOTE: Designation of questions eligible for the Final will be made on this day.)

Wed., July 13

17. Dilemmas of Statecraft in the Nuclear Age

- a. Origin and Conduct of the Cold War
Reading: None
Question: Was Franklin Roosevelt's grand design for peace doomed to failure?
- b. Is Modernity Obsolete?
Reading: Howard, 136-143
Question: None

Thurs., July 14

FINAL EXAMINATION

Appendix F:

NOTE: The following article is taken from the Wilson Quarterly, Spring 1983 edition. It is printed with the gracious permission of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, D.C.

"A HISTORY OF THE PAST: 'LIFE REEKED with JOY'" Anders Henriksson

"History," declared Henry Ford, "is bunk." And yet, to paraphrase George Santayana, those who forget history and the English language are condemned to mangle them. Historian Anders Henriksson, a five-year veteran of the university classroom, has faithfully recorded, from papers submitted by freshmen at McMaster University and the University of Alberta, his students' more striking insights into European history from the Middle Ages to the present. Possibly as an act of vengeance, Professor Henriksson has now assembled these individual fragments into a chronological narrative which we present here.

History, as we know, is always bias, because human beings have to be studied by other human beings, not by independent observers of another species.

During the Middle Ages, everybody was middle aged. Church and state were co-operative. Middle Evil society was made up of monks, lords, and surfs. It is unfortunate that we do not have a medieval European laid out on a table before us, ready for dissection. After a revival of infantile commerce slowly crept into Europe, merchants appeared. Some were sitters and some were drifters. They roamed from town to town exposing themselves and organized big fairies in the countryside. Medieval people were violent. Murder during this period was nothing. Everybody killed someone. England fought numerous times for land in France and ended up winning and losing. The Crusades were a series of military expeditions made by Christians seeking to free the holy land (the "Home Town" of Christ) from the Muslims.

In the 1400 hundreds most Englishmen were perpendicular. A class of yeowls arose. Finally, Europe caught the Black Death. The bubonic plague is a social disease in the sense that it can be transmitted by intercourse and other etceteras. It was spread from port to port by inflected rats. Victims of the Black Death grew boobs on their necks. The plague also helped the emergence of the English language as the national language of England, France and Italy.

The Middle Ages slimpared to a halt. The renaissance bolted in from the blue. Life reeked with joy. Italy became robust, and more individuals felt the value of their human beings. Italy, of course, was much closer to the rest of the world, thanks to nothern

Europe. Man was determined to civilise himself and his brothers, even if heads had to roll! It became sheik to be educated. Art was on a more associated level. Europe was full of incredible churches with great art bulging out their doors. Renaissance merchants were beautiful and almost lifelike.

The Reformation happened when German nobles resented the idea that tithes were going to Papal France or the Pope thus enriching Catholic coiffures. Traditions had become oppressive so they too were crushed in the wake of man's quest for resurrection above the not-just-social beast he had become. An angry Martin Luther nailed 95 theocrats to a church door. Theologically, Luther was into reorientation mutation. Calvinism was the most convenient religion since the days of the ancients. Anabaptist services tended to migratory. The Popes, of course, were usually Catholic. Monks went right on seeing themselves as worms. The last Jesuit priest died in the 19th century.

After the reformation were wars both foreign and infernal. If the Spanish could gain the Netherlands they would have a stronghold throughout northern Europe which would include their positions in Italy, Burgundy, central Europe and India thus surrounding France. The German Emperor's lower passage was blocked by the French for years and years.

Louis XIV became King of the Sun. He gave the people food and artillery. If he didn't like someone, he sent them to the gallows to row for the rest of their lives. Vauban was the royal minister of flirtation. In Russia the 17th century was known as the time of the bounding of the serfs. Russian nobles wore clothes only to humour Peter the Great. Peter filled his government with accidental people and built a new capital near the European boarder. Orthodox priests became government antennae.

The enlightenment was a reasonable time. Voltaire wrote a book called Candy that got him into trouble with Frederick the Great. Philosophers were unknown yet, and the fundamental stake was one of religious toleration slightly confused with defeatism. France was in a very serious state. Taxation was a great drain on the state budget. The French revolution was accomplished before it happened. The revolution evolved through monarchial, republican and totalitarian phases until it catapulted into Napoleon. Napoleon was ill with bladder problems and was very tense and unrestrained.

History, a record of things left behind by past generations, started in 1815. Throughout the comparatively radical years 1815-1870 the western European continent was undergoing a rampant period of economic modification. Industrialization was precipitating in England. Problems were so complexicated that in Paris, out of a city population of one million people, two million able bodies were on the loose.

Great Britain, the USA and other European countries had democratic leanings. The middle class was tired and needed a rest.

The old order could see the lid holding down new ideas beginning to shake. Among the goals of the chartists were universal suferage and an anal parliment. Voting was to be done by ballad.

A new time zone of national unification roared over the horizon. Founder of the new Italy was Cavour, an intelligent Sardine from the north. Nationalism aided Italy because nationalism is the growth of an army. We can see that nationalism succeeded for Italy because of France's big army. Napoleon III-IV mounted the French thrown. One thinks of Napoleon III as a live extension of the late, but great, Napoleon. Here too was the new Germany: loud, bold, vulgar, and full of reality.

Culture fomented from Europe's tip to its top. Richard Strauss, who was violent but methodical like his wife made him, plunged into vicious and perverse plays. Dramatized were adventures in seduction and abortion. Music reeked with reality. Wagner was master of music, and people did not forget his contribution. When he died they labeled his seat "historical." Other countries had their own artists. France had Chekhov.

World War I broke out around 1912-1914. Germany was on one side of France and Russia was on the other. At war people get killed, and then they aren't people any more, but friends. Peace was proclaimed at Versigh, which was attended by George Loid, Primal Minister of England. President Wilson arrived with 14 pointers. In 1937 Lenin revolted Russia. Communism raged among the peasants, and the civil war "team colours" were red and white.

Germany was displaced after WWI. This gave rise to Hitler. Germany was morbidly overexcited and unbalanced. Berlin became the decadent captial, where all forms of sexual deprivations were practised. A huge anti-semantic movement arose. Attractive slogans like "death to all Jews" were used by governmental groups. Hitler remilitarized the Rineland over a squirmish between Germany and France. The appeasers were blinded by the great red of the Soviets. Moosealini rested his foundations on eight million bayonets and invaded Hi Lee Salasy. Germany invaded Poland, France invaded Belgium, and Russia invaded everybody. War screeched to an end when a nukuleer explosion was dropped on Heroshima. A whole generation had been wiped out in two world wars, and their forlorne families were left to pick up the peaces.

According to Fromm, individuation began historically in medieval times. This was a period of small childhood. There is increasing experience as adolescence experiences its life development. The last stage is us.

The historian looks backward. In the end he also believes backward.
-Nietzsche.

APPENDIX G

Schematic Outline: Descriptions of Old Regimes Professor Robert Roeder, University of Denver

A. Preliminary Description.

1. Territorial extent.
2. Population trends.
3. Economic geography of major regions.
4. Basic framework of government.
5. Chronological sketch of major developments.

B. Structure of Institutions.

1. "Village" structure and functions.
2. Other primary groups.
3. Urban hierarchy.
4. Elite networks.
 - a. Aristocratic.
 - b. Religious.
 - c. Mercantile.
 - d. Other, if any.
 - e. Bureaucratic.
5. "Camp": Military structure.
6. "Court": Central government structure.
7. Ideological structure: dominant legitimating and directing ideas, traditions, beliefs.

C. Dynamics.

1. Examples of recurrent social problems and solutions.
2. Special crises and responses to them.
3. Important trends during the last generation of the old regime.

APPENDIX H

NOTE: Following is a list of world history textbooks recommended by Dr. Marilyn Hitchens.

Abramowitz, Jack, and Kenneth R. Job. Civilizations of the Past: Peoples and Cultures. New York: Globe Books Company, Inc, 1987.

Cappelluti, Frank, et al. The Human Adventure. Menlo Park, Calif.: Addison-Wesley Publishers, 1976.

Holt, Sol, and John R. O'Connor. Exploring World History--A Global Approach. New York: Globe Book Company, 1983.

Linder, Bertram L., et al. A World History--The Human Panorama. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1983.

Rabb, Theodore, et al. People and Nations--A World History. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983.

Roselle, Daniel. A World History--A Cultural Approach. Lexington, Mass.: Ginn and Company, 1976.

Roselle, Daniel. Our Common Heritage--A World History. Lexington, Mass.: Ginn and Company, 1984.

Wallbank, Thomas W., et al. History and Life--The World and Its People. 2nd ed. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman and Company, 1984.

APPENDIX I

List of 1983 U.S. Air Force Academy World History Workshop Participants:

John J. Cerny, Jr.
John H. Eddy, Jr.
Marlys Hardesty
Marilynn Jo Hitchens
Phyllis Holmes
Reg Holmes
Ernest A. Menze
Ralph Moyer
John P. Mueller
Richard A. Overfield
Kevin Reilly
Robert Roeder
Heidi Roupp
Arnold Schrier
Lynda Shaffer
John M. Thompson
William G. White
Ann O'Quinn Young
Donald Zimbrick

MILITARY

Colonel Carl W. Reddel
Major Joe C. Dixon
Major James E. Henderson
Captain John Albert
Captain Thomas E. Angle
Captain Ronnie M.A. Clodfelter
Captain Frederick C. Matusiak
Captain Richard J. Mueller
Captain Richard B. Mulanax
Captain John L. Poole
Captain David A. Robertson
Captain Spencer Way, Jr.
Captain Mark K. Wells

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT As it appears on the report.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) USAFA - TR-84-8			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Department of History USAF Academy		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) USAFA/DFH		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) HQ USAFA/DFH USAF Academy CO 80840		7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)			
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION USAFA/Department of History		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) USAFA/DFH		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) HQ USAFA/DFH USAF Academy CO 80840		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS.			
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) 1983 World History Workshop/Unclassified		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.		PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.
					WORK UNIT NO.
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Captain Frederick C. Matusiak, USAFA, Editor (others listed on reverse)					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final		13b. TIME COVERED FROM July 13 to 15, 1983		14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day) October 1984	
15. PAGE COUNT					
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.	History, world history, education, liberal education,		
05	04		military education, undergraduate education, survey courses,		
			USAF Academy, service academy, curriculum, core curriculum,		
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)					
This report contains the ideas of participants in the 1983 World History Workshop, sponsored by the U.S. Air Force Academy's Department of History, 13-15 July 1983. The various articles discuss the current state of world history programs at the secondary and undergraduate levels and examine different approaches to teaching world history.					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT. ☒ DTIC USERS ☐			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL FREDERICK C. MATUSIAK, Captain, USAF			22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code) (303) 472-3620		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL USAFA/DFH

Block 12 continued

Captain John Albert
Major Joe C. Dixon
Marilynn Hitchens
Kevin Reilly
Robert Roeder
Arnold Schrier
John M. Thompson

U.S. Air Force Academy
U.S. Air Force Academy
Wheat Ridge High School
Somerset County College
University of Denver
University of Cincinnati
American Universities Field Staff

Block 18 continued

educational objectives.